

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

What Do We Mean by the "Gospel" Today?

Daniel L. Migliore

Ready or Not, Here They Come

W. Robert Martin, Jr.

Adults in Crisis

James E. Loder

Thoughts on Liberation

Paul Verghese

Sermons:

Faith to Follow

N. Bruce McLeod

It Happens Only Once

S T Kimbrough, Jr.

Dead Ends and New Beginnings

Bruce O. Boston

Understanding Your Church Curriculum

D. Campbell Wyckoff

The COCU Liturgy: Intent versus Content

Laurence H. Stookey

Beyond the Wall

John R. Gray

The New English Bible, 1970

Bruce M. Metzger

VOLUME LXIII, NUMBER 1

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

James I. McCord

President

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

John M. Templeton, President

Bryant M. Kirkland, Vice-President

Frederick E. Christian, Secretary

Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, New York, N.Y., Treasurer

James I. Armstrong

Clem E. Biningar

Eugene Carson Blake

James A. Colston

Stewart S. Cort

Allan M. Frew

Milton A. Galamison

John T. Galloway

Miss Eleanor P. Kelly

Harry G. Kuch

Charles T. Leber, Jr.

Raymond I. Lindquist

J. Keith Loudon

Henry Luce III

Conrad H. Massa

Robert L. McNeil

W. Beverly Murphy

Clifford G. Pollock

Luther I. Replogle

William H. Scheide

Laird H. Simons, Jr.

W. Sherman Skinner

Frederick B. Speakman

George E. Sweazey

Daniel C. Thomas

William P. Thompson

James M. Tunnell, Jr.

Samuel G. Warr

David B. Watermulder

Irving A. West

Mrs. Frederick Weyerhaeuser

Charles Wright

George S. Young

TRUSTEES EMERITI

John G. Buchanan

Richard J. Dearborn

Peter K. Emmons

Henry Hird

Weir C. Ketler

John S. Linen

Thomas M. McMillan

Mrs. John J. Newberry

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

DONALD MACLEOD, *Editor*

EDWARD J. JURGI, *Book Review Editor*

THE BULLETIN is published quarterly by the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church at Princeton, New Jersey. Numbers 1, 2, and 3 of each volume are mailed free of charge to all alumni and on an exchange basis with various institutions. Numbers 4 and 5 in the series are the academic catalogues (undergraduate and graduate) of the Seminary and may be obtained by request to the Office of the Registrar.

Second class postage paid at Princeton, N.J. 08540

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

VOL. LXIII

NUMBER 1

Donald Macleod, Editor

Edward J. Jurji, Book Review Editor

Excerpta et Commentaria		3
What Do We Mean by the "Gospel" Today?	<i>Daniel L. Migliore</i>	13
Ready or Not, Here They Come	<i>W Robert Martin, Jr.</i>	21
Adults in Crisis	<i>James E. Loder</i>	32
Thoughts on Liberation: James Reeb and Herbert Marcuse	<i>Paul Verghese</i>	42
Sermons:		
Faith to Follow	<i>N. Bruce McLeod</i>	53
It Happens Only Once	<i>S T Kimbrough, Jr.</i>	62
Dead Ends and New Beginnings	<i>Bruce O. Boston</i>	71
Understanding Your Church Curriculum	<i>D. Campbell Wyckoff</i>	77
The COCU Liturgy: Intent versus Content	<i>Laurence H. Stookey</i>	85
Beyond the Wall	<i>John R. Gray</i>	95
The New English Bible, 1970	<i>Bruce M. Metzger</i>	99
BOOK REVIEWS:		
My Travel Diary: 1936, by Paul Tillich	<i>James I. McCord</i>	105
Theology and Meaning: A Critique of Metatheological Scepticism, by R. S. Heimbeck	<i>Diogenes Allen</i>	105
Sense and Nonsense in Religion, by Sten H. Stenson		106
Apology for Wonder, by Sam Keen		107-
The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretation of Scripture, by John Bowker	<i>Henry S. Gehman</i>	108 -
The Old Testament: An Introduction to its Literary, Historical, and Religious Traditions, by H. Keith Beebe	<i>Charles T. Fritsch</i>	109 -
The Old Testament and Jesus Christ, by Claus Westermann	<i>W. Malcolm Clark</i>	110 -
Translating for King James, trans. & ed. by Ward Allen	<i>Bruce M. Metzger</i>	111
Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel, by Robert P. Meye	<i>Cullen I K Story</i>	111 -
What is Form Criticism?, by Edgar V. McKnight	<i>David M. Hay</i>	112 -
What is Redaction Criticism?, by Norman Perrin		112 -
A Pastoral Counseling Casebook, by C. K. Aldrich & C. Nighswonger	<i>Seward Hiltner</i>	113

Preaching Today, by D. W. Cleverley Ford	Donald Macleod	114
Seeing Jesus Today, by John Bishop		114-115
The Crumbling Walls, by Lewis S. Mudge		115
Do You Understand What You Read?, by H. M. Kuitert		115-116
Revolution, Place, and Symbol, ed. by R. L. Hunt	Carl D. Reimers	116-117
Faculty Publications, 1969 (edited by Laurence H. Stookey)		118

Rolfe Zenger

A WORD ABOUT PREACHING

"... I am sympathetic with the suggestion that the ones largely responsible for the bleak state of preaching today are the preachers. We have not only capitulated to the attacks made on the preaching art—we have fostered them. While by the year 2000, a preacher may be as rare a bird as the whooping crane, it is rather unbecoming of one ordained to the task to be hastening his own extinction. We've talked about the 'boring monologue' when we were the ones who reduced preaching to that sad estate. Now heavens knows, and may the Lord forgive me, I've contributed my share to the list of boring monologues. But this has been when I've failed to keep my vow to be diligent in 'preaching the word.' I may add that I've listened to some pretty boring dialogues on occasion and some involvement sessions I've attended haven't exactly been thrillers. But if preaching is communication of theology based on the Living Word, and if the theology is alive and the communicator is alive—then how can the preaching be dull?

I judge no one when I say this for I too am under judgment, but the truth is that we preachers have not put enough 'sweat equity' into our preaching. When the task to which we are ordained was being attacked instead of girding up our mental and spiritual loins, we capitulated to the critics and in some cases joined forces with them. Our strategy should have been to make the preaching so relevant that the critics would be cut off from the source of supply. This is not a class in homiletics—if it were, I would not be the speaker—but I know these words are read by many ministers and laymen across the country and I am presumptuous enough to try to say a word of encouragement to them on this point. Let us use the materials that are ready to hand. Let us prepare to preach with one eye on the Scriptures and the other on the daily newspaper.

I told my congregation that when I want to know what the Church is doing I read the denominational journals; when I want to know what God is doing, I read the daily newspaper; and when I want to know what God wants me to do in his world and through the instrument of his Church, I read the New Testament."

(Quoted from *It's A Big Responsibility*, by W. Clarke MacDonald, p. 433, 1970).

Excerpta et Commentaria

by the EDITOR

Witherspoon and the New Rhetoric

THE term "rhetoric" has acquired a bad connotation in recent years for two reasons, at least: (i) It has become a "catch-all" name for all kinds of oratorical prolegomena to the common sense part of political speeches; and (ii) it is used to describe exaggerated and irresponsible public utterances which the hearer knows the speaker himself does not believe. Fortunately we have yet among us scholars of rhetoric who safeguard the identity of the real article by their research into its history and especially its use by writers and speakers of effective discourse.

One of America's leading students of rhetoric, Wilbur Samuel Howell, Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Princeton University, is the author of a forthcoming volume, entitled *Eighteenth Century British Logic and Rhetoric* (Princeton University Press). Any study of this period includes, of course, the name of John Witherspoon, 1723-1794, who is described by Dr. Howell as "the sixth president of Princeton, statesman, scholar, clergyman, signer of Declaration," and who is representative of those who "brought the affairs of their time into the classroom and made students see that eloquence was a part of the concern of mankind for liberty, national welfare, the rule of law, and moral truth."

In the current number of *University* (Summer, 1970, No. 45), Dr. Howell's discussion of Witherspoon is excerpted and presented under the caption, "Witherspoon on How to Speak and Write."

The article begins as follows: "Shortly after John Witherspoon came from his native Scotland in the fall of 1768 to become the sixth president of what is now Princeton University, he began delivering a series of 'Lectures on Eloquence' which on the whole is as perceptive and relevant today as it was more than 200 years ago" (p. 26). These lectures, Dr. Howell indicates, were sixteen in number and remained unpublished until six years after Witherspoon's death. Ashbel Green, eighth president of Princeton University, discovered them in manuscript form among Witherspoon's papers and persuaded a Philadelphia printer to include them in future editions of the late president's writings. In their original form they consisted of condensed notes on which Witherspoon elaborated in the classroom as he went along.

In our day when the discipline needed for good writing is scoffed at (e.g., the Seminary student who says, "Why should I try to write well? My sermons will never be published") and superficial talking is widespread, Witherspoon would emphasize the close relationship of writing and delivery in effective communication. Howell quotes him, "articulate language is intended to communicate our

sentiments to one another. . . . It includes information and persuasion. The excellence of a conception in my mind, when spoken, consists in making another perceive what I perceive, and feel towards it as I feel. These two particulars show the true original purpose of speech. Eloquence is commonly called the art of persuasion, but . . . we must inform before we can persuade, or if there be any such thing as persuasion without information it is only a blind impulse."

It is significant to note Witherspoon's comment on the comparative role of oratory and poetry, especially their progress within specific contexts and situations. "A poet pleases and obtains fame from every single person who reads or hears his productions; but an assembly and an occasion are necessary to the orator. . . . Oratory could not thrive in a state where arbitrary power prevails, because there is nothing left for large assemblies and a diffusive public to determine; whereas poetry is pleasing to persons under any form of government whatever."

Although Witherspoon indicated his complete familiarity with the principles and modes of classic oratory—Greek and Roman—yet he was not a blind disciple of any one school. He advocated selection among modes according to the writer or speaker's immediate purpose, but he made it clear that the simple and the sublime were not mutually exclusive. Dr. Howell quotes: "I would observe, therefore, in the very beginning, it is a mistake to consider simplicity and sublimity as universally opposite, for on the contrary there is not only great excellence in some performances which we may call wholly of the simple kind; such as a story or an epistle written with all the beauty of simplicity, but in the most sublime and animated compositions, some of the greatest sentiments derive their beauty from being clothed in simple language."

Witherspoon's lectures, Dr. Howell continues, have much to say about the traditional subjects of rhetorical method and style.

1. *Invention*: The new rhetoric, Witherspoon stated would associate invention with creative effort; it is "nothing else than finding out the sentiments by which a speaker or writer would explain what he has to propose, and the arguments by which he should enforce it." This, he felt, could not be taught; it is dependent upon "capacity and experience." Therefore he deplored the method of teaching invention employed by the old rhetoric in providing a complex machinery of topics and illustrations which, he felt, made "the one who makes use of them like a man walking on stilts; they make him look very big, but he walks very feebly."

2. *Disposition*: By disposition Witherspoon meant "good order" or "that which makes a discourse clear, strong, easy to remember, beautiful, and brief." For this he suggested that "an orator before he begins his discourse should concentrate the subject and reduce it to one single proposition." This was basic, but equally important is amplification. Dr. Howell sums up Witherspoon's directives regarding order: "It should be clear and plain and it should make the sub-divisions distinct, proportionate to the size of the whole, co-ordinate in kind, exhaustive in extent, and connected with each other as naturally as possible." Witherspoon leaned toward reasoning of the syllogistic form, but he urged that it be "relaxed and

not call attention to itself." Regarding structure he moved away from the old rhetoric which spoke in terms of four and five-part speeches and put in their place "the new three-part structure drawn from the poetics." His rule was closer to a principle of operation which said that "every regular discourse or composition of every kind must have a beginning, a middle, and an end."

3. *Pulpit, Bar, and Assembly*: Witherspoon singled out these contexts in order, as he said, "to delineate the character of an accomplished minister, lawyer, or senator." To clergymen his advice was "a strict adherence to truth and nature, and taking the world just as it is, will be an excellent means to direct us in every part of our public service." To all speakers before assemblies he recommended fervor and passion commensurate with the urgency of such subjects as "the fate of nations, the welfare of our country, liberty or servitude." Indeed Witherspoon's new rhetoric suggested that eloquence "was a part of the concern of mankind for liberty, national welfare, the rule of law, and moral truth." Divorced from these, he felt, the teaching of eloquence had no point.

Dr. Howell observes that Witherspoon was the first to introduce the "new rhetoric" into American higher education. His purpose was "to produce an acceptable degree of literary and oratorical competence in each graduate; and the rest of the curriculum would meanwhile have made him competent in classical literature, in mathematics, in geography, in history, in logic, in natural philosophy, in ethics, and in politics." As for results, Dr. Howell adds this comment: "If the writings of several of the young men who graduated from Princeton under Witherspoon came later to constitute a distinguished part of American political literature of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—and, after all, James Madison was one of these graduates, and his contributions to *The Federalist* have great literary merit—then perhaps some of the credit for this outcome belongs to Witherspoon's lectures on eloquence and to his insistence that the new rhetoric be made a serious and continuous ingredient of each student's undergraduate experience."

The New Pentecostalism

Recently two metropolitan daily newspapers gave considerable prominence to the rise of "Pentecostalism" both inside and outside the established churches, especially among young people. Traditionally Pentecostalism has been associated with the American frontier and the less privileged classes. Today it is the fastest growing Christian denomination in the world with some fifteen million active members. Hitherto it had made few inroads among the established middle class or "mainline" Protestant and Roman Catholic churches. However, a new phase of its activity has developed; it emerges in erratic patterns that cross denominational fences and social levels. In some cases it is a reaction against the rational character of Protestant worship and in others it is a matter of turning away from Catholicism that appears to be too closely aligned with the "system."

One form of this complex phenomenon is "the revival of mystical religious belief in youth culture." Most of its adherents come from among young Protestant unchurched. Curiously enough these are mainly young adults who have become

disenchanted with the drug habit and are now caught up in a strange concern for the supernatural. Recently The New York *Times* told of a thirty-year-old former disc jockey who had experienced a conversion during a drug delirium and is now spending much of his time warning others "that drugs and the occult are the 'sorceries' spoken of in the Bible and are demonic devices for leading the young away from God." In an interview he declared: "I went the political route and then through the drug trip. We're all looking for life's reality. Jesus said, 'I am the truth'—and that's where reality is at."

Although each of these persons comes by way of a peculiarly individual route and is reacting to something deeply personal in his own life—a sense of failure, an unhappy love affair, a grievance against psychotherapy—yet their common search for identity brings them together into informal groups where "they sing, raise their hands above their heads, and whisper 'Hallelujah' as if in secret conversation with God." As with most other pentecostals the phenomenon of "speaking in tongues" is the confirmation of direct contact with God being made. However, the "speaking in tongues" experience is calm and in a low key as contrasted with those ethnic groups in which the congregation becomes greatly agitated. Morality and ethical decisions in these groups is a matter of a "sharp conscience" by which individually persons are led to delineate between right and wrong.

An example of pentecostalism within the framework of the establishment is found on any Friday evening at St. Boniface's Roman Catholic Church rectory in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Labeled as "community of prayer" and led by Redemptorist Brother Pancratius Boudreau of St. Boniface's staff, a group of some 80 persons—nuns, priests, students, laborers, and professionals—come from all over the metropolitan area. The meeting may last over three hours and is marked by "joyous group devotions." Its beginning dates back about five years and came originally from Main Line Protestant groups who in turn received their inspiration from such sects as the Assemblies of God and the United Pentecostal Church.

In response to a newspaper reporter from The Evening *Bulletin* (Philadelphia), Father Boudreau declared, "It's just a prayer meeting." Yet the following paragraph described "what went on":

"A nun started singing in a clear, floating soprano, 'Alleluia, Alleluia. . . .' Then the whole group joined in, 'singing in tongues,' each voice taking its own melodic line, each pronouncing its own pattering fall of syllables. The effect was ethereal.

"As the singing died away, the 'moderator,' a Roman Catholic priest, suggested prayers for forgiveness. Voices started calling out from every part of the room, 'For intolerance,' 'For impatience,' 'For failing to share ourselves with others.' 'Lord have mercy,' the group said in unison after each prayer for forgiveness.

"Then came a spirited song, lined out verse by verse by the moderator, accompanied by guitar, two tambourines, and clapping hands.

"Then prayers—conventional ones like 'Our Father,' 'Hail Mary,' 'Glory be to the Father,' followed by praying in tongues, with each participant giving unique

utterances, impossible for a stranger to the group to follow a flurry of syllables 'Matia fra bidlo cranten frosada. . . .'

"Then came 'witnesses'—examples of God's help. A woman overcame the pain of a kidney infection, a man was saved when a barn floor collapsed, a nun obtained the loan of a station wagon for a proposed trip. All these and other bits of good fortune were attributed to group and individual prayer. Each testimonial was followed by 'Praise God!' from the group and applause."

In November 1969, a special commission reported favorably to a U.S. Catholic Bishops' conference on this Pentecostal movement. "The movement should at this point not be inhibited but allowed to develop," was the conclusion. Statistics are hard to come by, but it is estimated that 40,000 Roman Catholics in colleges, churches, and monasteries have been caught up in this new pentecostalism.

Dickens—A Century Later

On June 9, 1870, Charles Dickens died. On the same date in 1970, Britain began a summer-long tribute to its most distinguished novelist. A memorial service, attended by the Queen Mother, was held in Westminster Abbey and a wreath was laid on his grave in Poet's Corner. His major works, comprising thirty-eight volumes, have been reprinted and at least a dozen centenary books have re-assessed his place as an English man of letters.

Dickens was a mirror of the darker aspects of Victorian London and perhaps, apart from Shakespeare, no other writer has created characters whose virtues or faults have found identification in every domestic household. Even though the social and cultural *milieu* that gave rise to *Oliver Twist*, *Nicholas Nickleby*, and *Ebenezer Scrooge* died with nineteenth century London, yet Dickens' books sell in America at the rate of one million a year (with *The Tale of Two Cities* a favorite).

Among recent revaluations of the novelist, several critics have observed, with the benefit of the perspective of the intervening century, that Dickens' temperament—his bitter spasms of depression—has had a traceable impact upon the works of Tolstoy, Kafka, H. G. Wells, Dostoevski, and Proust. But Angus Wilson, author of the new volume, *The World of Charles Dickens*, comments: "What people mostly remember are the people, the characters, the tremendous giants who talk and talk and talk and yet cannot break down that terrible alienation that comes to us all in city life." Further on he adds, "But it is the climate that makes these characters live, and the climate is supplied by the author's wonderful use of language—a hurried, lively, violent use, yet it is one which is tremendously detailed."

C. P. Snow refers to Dickens as the greatest novelist who ever lived and said: "In many ways he reminds one, at a time when he was writing the dark novels of his last period, of a middle-aged American liberal of the present day who has had great hopes and found them eroded, who doesn't like what he sees around them and can't find a place to stand, who is, nevertheless, unbreakably bound to the society in which he grew up."

Dickens himself, shortly before his death at the early age of fifty-eight, observed: "I am incapable of rest . . . however strange it is, never to be at rest, never satisfied, and ever trying after something that is never reached—how clear it is that it must be and that one is driven on by an irresistible might until the journey is worked out."

Sermons and the Daily Press

Preaching may be in temporary eclipse as an effective means of communicating religious truth. This was inevitable because the number of ministers who would work at it seriously and pay the high price to do it well have become a tiny minority amid a babble of open-ended panels that witness to nothing and reduce Christianity to a least common denominator. It is heartening for those who believe in preaching to note that "it will not down" and with the forfeiture of responsibility among the clergy to see lay writers, maybe quite unconsciously, taking it up. Most of us were stirred by James Reston's editorial, "The Paradox of Easter," which spoke with a deeper sense of reflection and relevance than the messages from many Christian pulpits on Easter Day 1970 (*New York Times*, March 29, 1970).

Reston detected beneath the Easter festival of 1970 a peculiar tension: "The ancient religious festival of hope and faith has seldom been celebrated with more color and more doubt." This tension arose from at least one identifiable source: ". . . having ignored the obligations, sacrifices, and disciplines of Lent, we have insisted on the rejoicings of Easter. But somehow it doesn't work; we celebrate what we didn't earn, and sing of heaven but feel like hell." Other related factors are less easily delineated and are more, in Reston's opinion, an aspect of the vast sociological-cultural complex: the growing power of the city and the struggle of persons to retain their individuality; the Easter throngs in the churches and the superficiality of a faith that merely "believes in believing"; a loss of faith in the old religious doctrines and the inability to find in the new secularism any "common moral or intellectual discipline" or "a star to steer by." We are, as Lincoln said, "bereft of faith and terrified by scepticism." Or, as Reston comments, "We have rejected our religious and classical heritage, but are disgusted with the secular logic and politics we have put in its place."

Where do we go from here, then? Reston, who appreciates the lessons of history, observes that "the ancient philosophers, religious and secular, agreed that nothing could be proved absolutely; therefore they had to believe in something beyond logic, which is faith or belief." The modern generation, he feels, relies upon logic and the mind and rejects faith which is the basis of hope. Hence the proliferation of tension everywhere: the "now" generation seems to be crying for "a new religion," but it cannot hope because it lacks the basis of faith. Easter is the festival of hope, but it remains a puzzling paradox to those whose faith does not embrace the resurrection fact.

New Hymn Book

Experiments in ecumenicity can be launched most easily by means of a hymn book. It is curious that so little by way of this method has been tried. Within a year the Anglican and United Churches of Canada will publish a new joint hymn book. In an article entitled, "What's In, What's Out, What's What," *The Observer*, official magazine of the United Church, describes the book as follows:

"It will contain 500 of what the editors guarantee are among the finest hymns in the English language, culled from some 10,000, written as long ago as the fourth century or as recently as last year. About 275 come from the present United Church *Hymnary*—but another 400 will be missing.

"In the new book, Victorian piety, crinoline, sentiment, sweetness, the glories of war, flying angels, death beds, vale of tears, and leaning on the breast of Jesus are out, out, out. Realism, social purpose, community, and sound theology are in."

Bishop Wilkinson of Toronto, chairman of the two-denominational hymnary committee, commented, "We've tried to keep the best of the past that is really usable in the present and future. All the great hymns found their way in."

The committee has met long and often, but was determined always to keep its objectives clear and its criteria unshaken. Routine comments by members of both denominations were indicative of the committee's overall intention: one said, "A book with words that make sense and tunes you can sing could help to revitalize worship." Another remarked, "A hymn is a prayer said in unison in a singing voice." Still another added, "I want a hymn to say something for me I've always wanted to say to God but haven't had the words for it." One other expressed the committee's sense of preference more generally: "What you want to say has to be sound theologically, in words of good literary quality, and sung to a tune of acceptable musical quality, or it won't get into the new hymn book."

According to these standards, here are some of the hymns that are in: "Praise my soul the king of heaven," "Praise to the Lord the almighty the king of creation," "Guide me O Thou great Jehovah," "Where cross the crowded ways of life," "God the omnipotent," "Just as I am," "Brightest and best of the sons of the morning," "He's got the whole world in his hands," "Go tell it on the mountain," "Lord of the dance," "Let us break bread together," and "Mine eyes have seen the glory."

By the same standards, *The Observer* indicates the following are out: "By cool Siloam's shady rill" (Where is Siloam? What's a shady rill? What does it say about baptism? Nothing!), "From Greenland's icy mountains" (Who can honestly believe today that "they call us to deliver their land from error's chain"?), "Onward Christian soldiers" ("We are not divided" is a lie.), "O valiant hearts" (It is unrealistic to speak any more about soldiers, "proudly gathered"), and "The son of God goes forth to war" (War is repulsive, not glorious). Some others, among the "old favorites," are in, but with careful editing; e.g., "Jesus loves me," "New every morning is the love," and "Take my life and let it be." A professor of

English on the committee commented, "We prefer to emphasize the strength of Jesus rather than an androgynous sentimental sweetness."

The committee went through the United Church *Hymnary* first and graded its 691 hymns from A to D; for example, "Lord of all being" was grade A, whereas "Softly and tenderly" merited grade D. Then a similar rating was given 812 hymns in the Anglican book. From 350 already in both books, 215 were chosen. Ninety others from the Anglican book will be new to the United Church; and sixty (Scottish psalms and paraphrases, Wesley compositions, and social action hymns) from the United Church will be new to Anglicans.

What about the modern hymns? Literally thousands of new compositions were sent in, but the committee rejected two-thirds of them as being generally disappointing. "Too many present day composers," one remarked, "imitate the old ones." Of the majority of new compositions, the question was asked, "Could this have been written 100 years ago?" Too often the answer could be, "Yes." Yet a minority was acceptable because "they say things the way we want to say them today, with freshness, verve, and perception."

Probably the committee's greatest problem lay in the category of the "Gospel Hymns." It was easy to collect grade A hymns in the "Praise" sections, but among the so-called "good old hymns" there were opinions and arguments a-plenty. "There's no logic in people's emotional reactions to hymns," said an Anglican bishop. And no rational argument can exclude a hymn that "has won a place in the people's hearts." A questionnaire was sent out to 100 clergy and lay people across the nation inviting opinions regarding so-called "Gospel Hymns." The same twenty-one of these turned up on over fifty per cent of the lists and "There is a green hill far away" made every list save one. Twenty of these twenty-one will be in the new book. They are: "There is a green hill far away," "Jesus, lover of my soul," "What a friend we have in Jesus," "We sing the praise of him who died," "Souls of men why will ye scatter," "Rock of ages," "My faith looks up to thee," "Art thou weary," "Beneath the cross of Jesus," "Take my life and let it be," "Just as I am," "Will your anchor hold," "I heard the voice of Jesus say," "Hark my soul, it is the Lord," "I need thee every hour," "Come let us sing of a wonderful love," "More love to thee," "My song is love unknown," "Tell me the old, old story," and "He leadeth me."

The unanswered question regarding any hymn book: Will the congregations "buy it"? One clergyman said, "Whether the congregation appreciates the riches provided for it is up to the ministers. It takes imaginative promotion, but if the clergy are keen on introducing new and better music and words, the people will respond."

"One of our ideals is that we offer in praise and worship our very best. One of the tasks of the church's leadership is to help people worship in terms that are worthy of what they are doing. It is a poor thing for the people of God gathered together to offer the second rate, the shoddy, the sentimental, in the worship of God."

Contemporary Prayers

The ability to write meaningful prayers in contemporary idiom that reflects at the same time a good level of literary taste is a gift shared by few. The number of ministers possessing real competence in the composition of prayers is diminishing. What is more serious, however, is that the framers of curricula in theological seminaries today rarely take into account that in the average pastorate a minister offers prayer in public more often than he does any other official or professional act. Yet no seminary to our knowledge has a specific course where students learn the art of prayer composition on the practical side or where they are exposed on the theological side to such questions as: What is prayer? Why pray? Who are the classic writers of prayer? Is intercessory prayer of any use?

The reader's market is flooded with a stream of devotional books of every kind. Many are superficial and deserve the neglect they receive. Occasionally a classic appears; for example, John Baillie's *Diary of Private Prayer* which has sold in the tens of thousands. Most books of contemporary prayers, however, are theologically sterile and exceedingly shy on reverence. An exception in this latter category is Michel Quoist's *Prayers of Life* (Gill, Dublin, 1963) which has done much to demonstrate how one can speak to God in the modern idiom without becoming common or cheap.

Recently a fresh voice has been heard in the prayers of Jeanette Struchen, a high school English teacher in Midland Park, New Jersey, who holds theological degrees from Garrett Seminary in Evanston and Union Theological Seminary, New York. Mrs. Struchen's two earlier volumes of prayers demonstrated her genius and competence in devotional expression: *Prayers to Pray without Really Trying* and *Prayers to Pray wherever You Are*. This year a third collection has been added, *Thank God for the Red, White, and Black* (J. B. Lippincott Co., East Washington Square, Philadelphia, Penna. 19105. \$1.95). These pages reflect the thoughts of a person who believes in a certain way about prayer. "Prayer," writes the author, "is belief that someone is listening. I can believe in God and not pray, but I cannot pray disbelieving in God." Then there follow forty-six devotional gems that are artistically composed yet marked by closeness to our common-earthiness and a cognizance of God's ability to work through those whose openness lets him in. What is more, these prayers are so earnestly judgmental that we are moved to confession; indeed if prayers can also be prophetic, these are. Let Jeanette Struchen lead us in prayer:

Lord, we need a switched-on miracle.
A lot of people are starving
and
feeding them looks like a mission impossible.
We've studied them
stared at them
counted them
organized them

collected for them
editorialized them
prayed for them
and
buried them.

Now we need a few loaves, a couple of fish, and You.

Dialogue Preaching

Although there has been much discussion among ministers and in homiletics classes about dialogue preaching, no one can testify that he has heard it being done consistently well. Moreover, much of the discussion has been somewhat out of focus on account of a general failure adequately to define our terms. For this and other reasons, most teachers of preaching welcomed the appearance recently of the first book on the theory of dialogue preaching, published by Judson Press and written jointly by two members of the faculty at Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, William D. Thompson and Gordon C. Bennett.

This volume makes clear at the outset that there is a "difference between dialogue as principle and dialogue as method. If dialogue is understood as an approach to people, a lecture may be dialogical, even though only one person is talking, provided the lecturer takes into account the experiences which are brought by all the people to the whole speaking-listening encounter. Conversely, a platform dialogue in which the speakers fail to relate to each other or to their audience may have a monological effect, even though two persons are talking.

"There is no doubt about it: communicative preaching is dialogical and always has been. It is characterized by the preacher's concern for the attitudes, experiences, and needs of his people. . . . In this book, however, we are not dealing primarily with dialogue as a principle, but with dialogue as a method of preaching. We define dialogue preaching to be an act within the context of public worship in which two or more persons engage in a verbal exchange as the sermon or message" (pp. 8-9).

With this thesis in mind the authors present four helpful chapters: "How Dialogue Preaching Began," "The Congregation in Dialogue," "Dialogue in the Chancel," and "The Values of Dialogue Preaching." Then Chapter Five follows with "An Anthology of Dialogue Sermons," including various classifications, for example, dialogues of support, of inquiry, and of conflict. Probably dialogue sermons suffer more than the monologue in the transfer from the "live" situation to the printed page, yet the anthology is a very useful inclusion of examples of how some have tried to do it. The theory section of this book is excellent; the sermons impress us with the advantages of this method and at the same time alert us to its latent weaknesses. (*Dialogue Preaching*, by W. D. Thompson & G. C. Bennett. Judson Press, Valley Forge, Penna. 1948. \$4.95.)

What Do We Mean by the "Gospel" Today?

by DANIEL L. MIGLIORE

TIMELINESS is an essential quality of the right understanding and proclamation of the gospel. The gospel can be timely only as it assumes new and bold forms in relation to the actual historical situation and the particular needs of men in their own time. This is not to deny a real continuity in the witness and mission of the church in various periods and places. Nor is it to endorse an unqualified relativism. But it is to emphasize that God's good news comes to a different focus in different times and circumstances, that the Christian story must be retold again and again in new terms appropriate to the ongoing historical experience of men. The gospel both shapes and is shaped by the concrete experience and cultural activity of men in their time. My assigned topic—What do we mean by the "gospel" today?—underlines this characteristic timeliness of genuine Christian proclamation and action.

I

We must insist upon the timeliness or historicity of the gospel because man is a historical being. History is the story of man's interaction with his natural and social environment. Man's relationship to the "world" around him, unlike that of the other creatures, is not closed but open. Man becomes human, dis-

Paper given at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Homiletics, December 5, 1969, by Daniel L. Migliore, associate professor of theology, Princeton Theological Seminary. Dr. Migliore is an alumnus of Westminster College, Penna., of Princeton Theological Seminary, and holds the Ph.D. degree from Princeton University. A sabbatical leave was spent at the University of Tübingen, Germany.

covers his identity, in an open process of interaction with and re-creation of his natural and social world. He is both a receiver and a creator of meaning; he is both a child of and a responsible master over his natural environment and the human world of culture and social institutions. Since man's will to create easily changes into the will to dominate, history is both a story of humanization and of aggression and exploitation, a story of enslavement and the struggle for liberation. The dynamic of history is the human impulse to transcend an inherited world, to move beyond the standardized boundaries of received reality, and the strong resistance which this impulse meets. This human quest for "transcendence" is inspired by memories of unfulfilled possibilities and by hopes of a qualitatively new future.

The gospel mediates a transcending vision and power only within the context of the ongoing historical struggles and hopes of men. Precisely when the structures of an old world have begun to shake and increasing numbers of men have begun to experience it as a house of bondage rather than a laboratory of freedom, the Christian message may come to timely and provocative expression.

My first contention, then, is that *the gospel today has to take shape in rela-*

tion to the present struggles of men for liberation from the ethos and objectives of affluent technocratic society. The impressive technical achievements of the modernized nations are deeply imbedded in patterns of political, economic, and cultural domination. Many men today are trying in various ways to break free of this domination. The black liberation movement, the protest of idealistic white youth against an affluent but shallow technological culture geared to materialistic and militaristic ends, the awakening of the people of the "third world" of Africa, Asia, and Latin America to their right to control their own destiny—these are the most dramatic large-scale movements of our time which express an acute sense of entrapment and a sometimes desperate hope of liberation. These movements or "counter cultures" are bearers of a powerful critique of both modern western culture and the Christian church as the religious tutor of this culture. Though still only loosely aligned with each other, these counter cultures are broadly united in their rejection of the present "system" and in their will, in the words of Frantz Fanon, to "set afoot a new man" on this earth.

One of the remarkable characteristics of these developing counter cultures is their frank recognition of the fact that real human liberation involves not only political change but a profound transformation of human consciousness and sensibility. Ameliorative social activism may be as superficial a response to an oppressive culture as the eschewing of all political engagement in favor of a "trip" into the limitless regions of one's own psychic reality. Many of the new rebels are not concerned simply about

the transfiguration of present social and political structures; they are also looking for a qualitatively new perception of reality, a new vision of what it means to be human. As Theodore Roszak says in *The Making of a Counter Culture*: "The primary project of our counter culture is to proclaim a new heaven and a new earth so vast, so marvelous that the inordinate claims of technical expertise must of necessity withdraw in the presence of such splendor to a subordinate and marginal status in the lives of men."

At the same time, vision without action is impotent; mysticism without politics is escapist. Man discovers a new identity not simply by the use of imagination but by imaginative practice. He finds new dimensions of his humanity as he engages with others in concrete efforts to overcome oppression and to construct a new world. Such engagement is not a private affair but necessarily a social task.

The personal and the political, the imaginative and the practical dimensions of human liberation are not easily held together. They tend to drift apart and become alternatives. Perhaps this provides a clue to the right understanding of the gospel in our time. The gospel today has to speak of the need and possibility of the radical transformation of total man and his total world. And this message must be developed in the closest possible relationship to the concrete struggles of men today to be free.

II

Moving a step further, I suggest that *the proclamation of the gospel that is timely in the sense of being closely related to the present struggles for the*

liberation of man involves honest criticism of past understandings of the Christian message and the willingness to take real risks in proclaiming it afresh. It is much safer to repeat a timeless message. If one undertakes to discover the meaning of the gospel in relation to present conflicts and expectations, the dangers of onesidedness and distortion will certainly accompany the effort. When James Cone states in *Black Theology and Black Power* that in America today "Christ means black power," he is offering an extraordinarily daring and provocative focus for Christian proclamation. Properly interpreted, there is considerably more biblical and theological justification for Cone's rendition of the gospel than many white churchmen are likely to concede. Still, it is, like every effort to proclaim the gospel in a timely way, a risk. The church has the responsibility of listening for God's word of judgment and grace in such risky proclamation.

On the other hand, we may wonder whether sufficient risk is involved in the more popular interpretation of the gospel in our time as the message of reconciliation. This interpretation has achieved impressive formulation in the Confession of 1967 of the United Presbyterian Church. The choice of the theme of reconciliation as a focus for the gospel today has much to commend it. But it is a theme that may encourage the church to skip lightly over the deep conflicts of our time rather than entering into them and taking them into itself. The motif of reconciliation may be co-opted too easily by those who want to avoid confrontation and conflict, even when basic questions of justice and

human dignity are at stake. The call to reconciliation then becomes a way of denying the reality of conflict and of minimizing friction.

Thus while every timely proclamation of the gospel attuned to the present struggles of men to change a demeaning and unjust situation runs the risks of onesidedness and oversimplification, there are even more serious dangers in trying to avoid these risks. Unless the proclamation and action of the church are forged anew in relation to contemporary human experience, unless the church shares deeply the hurts and hopes of men today, unless it enters into the conflicts of our time and becomes an advocate rather than a neutral mediator, its efforts to communicate the Christian message will die the "death of a thousand qualifications." A gospel equally compatible with all possibilities is meaningless. If history is the arena of human conflict, domination, and the search for freedom, the gospel must be a word of liberation and hope as well as a word of reconciliation.

Today the church must be willing to risk critical but sincere collaboration with those who are alienated from the present order of things. Critics of contemporary technocratic culture are searching for new images and symbols of full human life in terms of which they can both oppose the given conditions of oppression and work constructively toward a new reality. They are looking for new guiding images of what it means to be human and for a sustaining community with its own innovative life style.

The traditional formative images of western culture have lost their power. Modern technological culture, mean-

while, appears to be hypnotized by the prospect of a fully computerized society in which all "irrational" dissent and elemental passions and feelings are repressed. The question which confronts the church in this situation is whether it is willing to re-discover the meaning of the gospel in collaboration with the oppressed and discontented who have begun an exodus from the established order in search of new images of human fulfillment and an alternative to a way of life whose first priority, the experience of the wretched of the earth notwithstanding, is the preservation of the status quo.

III

The Christian church is a historical community whose peculiar memory, language, life-style, and expectation are rooted in particular events which are attested as revelatory or paradigmatic of full human life. It was the mistake of the so-called biblical theology movement of recent decades to think that the great symbols of the Christian heritage can independently illuminate the life of man. And it has been the mistake of recent hermeneutical theology to assume that the Christian symbols need only to be translated into current philosophical categories to function in our time as they have in the past.

The truth of the matter is that the Christian memory and its symbols, however sophisticated their translation, cannot be simply superimposed upon present experience without doing violence both to the gospel and to the integrity of man. Rather, we must engage in an ongoing dialogue between our theological heritage and the concrete experience of men in modern so-

ciety. In this process we will no doubt discover that much of the tradition says very little, if anything, even to those of us who take the trouble to examine it. Still, the memory of man—and the memory of a community of faith in particular—can make a significant contribution to the process of radical personal and social change. While memory may degenerate into archaism, it may also function to keep men critical of the present and to expand their horizon of real possibilities. The memory of the Christian community invokes a forgotten or betrayed dimension of full human life and thus helps to keep the future of man open. *As the Christian community collaborates with those who experience the present situation as oppressive, the biblical message of freedom may take on fresh meaning and power, may be repossessed as a language of prophetic protest and of creative imagination in the service of the realization of a free humanity.*

The criterion of authentic Christian witness is not conformity to the language of the past. Gerhard Ebeling has offered a more appropriate measure: "We do not get at the nature of words by asking what they contain, but by asking what they effect, what they set going, what future they disclose." If the church remembers its past from the context of real involvement in the freedom struggles of today, it may discover that what the message of early Christianity "set going" was a radical spirit of freedom. And this gospel of freedom—the freedom bestowed by Jesus—may once again come alive with power, may release new images of man and new forces of personal and social transformation.

The Apostle Paul testifies that it is for freedom that Christ has set men free (Gal. 5:1). This is not a freedom of the inner life of man only but a comprehensive freedom. Indeed, the early church confesses that with the coming of Christ, the entire creation now eagerly awaits "the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. 8:19ff.). The Bible may be read as witness to the struggle for freedom. In the Old Testament, the liberation of the people of Israel from Egyptian bondage constitutes the central paradigm of what God intends for man. In the New Testament, the life, death and resurrection of Jesus the Christ is seen as a new and decisive breakthrough in the story of human freedom.

Jesus announced liberation to the captives. He proclaimed the kingdom of God which is the kingdom of freedom and love. More than that, he showed by his activity that he was himself free and that he could help others to be free. He freed men from the bondage of legalism, he pronounced God's forgiveness and thus freed men from the tyranny of guilt, and he called men to undergo the death of the old self and its world in order to enter into the new life of freedom to love and care for others. As the English title of Ernst Käsemann's recent book sums up the matter, *Jesus Means Freedom*.

Paul caught the precise import of the message and ministry of Jesus when he wrote, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, freedom is there" (2 Cor. 3:17). To be "in Christ" is to share and extend God's spirit of freedom in the world. The church is to be a herald and sign of the coming kingdom of freedom. Freedom in Christ inaugurates a new community

of free men. In this community a transforming power is at work enabling men to transcend their self-centered world, opening them to the future, empowering them to love others as they know they are loved by God, bestowing on them the freedom to affirm their neighbors gladly and delight in their otherness. The miracle of the early church for Paul was that it embraced Jews and Gentiles. The Jew-Gentile division in the first century was as deep as the black-white division in America today. Paul saw in the overcoming of this division a concrete social expression of the spirit of freedom originating in Christ.

If we look at the church as a herald of God's spirit of freedom in the world rather than as the sole instrument and the goal of God's liberating activity, we will refrain from all pretentious ecclesiastical claims. The church is a provisional realization of the still unfinished community of free men which Jesus called the kingdom of God. Because the church is only a provisional realization of the eschatological community of freedom, we will expect to find the spirit of freedom active in events, movements and men in "secular" history and culture. Wherever men are freed from bondage, be it political, economic, intellectual or spiritual, and wherever they are given new possibilities of becoming more truly human in mutually upbuilding relationships with their fellowmen, the church will recognize a common spirit at work.

A church which accepts its own relativity and provisionality will not think that it has something to contribute but nothing to gain in collaboration with secular liberation movements. Indeed,

it will frequently discover that these movements and the images and hopes which they cast up make possible a deepened understanding of the church's own message and mission. Secular culture has taught the Christian community to see dimensions of freedom in Christ which it did not discern on its own even over a period of many centuries. Active resistance to an evil government, for example, is not encouraged by Paul's proclamation of the gospel. But it has become part of a fuller understanding of the gospel in the wake of the subsequent historical experience of man.

IV

There is no freedom without conflict and struggle. The collaborative process between church and secular liberation activities should not become a mere intellectual exercise. The powers which enslave man do not easily relinquish their hold on him. The language and obedience of faith will have to be reformed in the experience of conflict.

To repeat what I said earlier: The danger of "reconciliation" as a slogan of contemporary Christian preaching and mission is that it is readily invoked to avoid the realities of conflict in human life and the costliness of the struggle for justice, freedom and human dignity. Popularly interpreted, the ministry of reconciliation may suggest the role of the uninvolved mediator, the disinterested third party whose job is to bring together the alienated opponents and help them arrive at a workable compromise. There is, no doubt, a place for such mediatory roles in every society. But such an understanding of the church's ministry of reconciliation

would cheapen the New Testament proclamation. The gospel Jesus proclaimed and embodied recognized the hard way of the cross, of death and resurrection, as the only road to genuine reconciliation.

Hence *the gospel of freedom cannot be neutral or indifferent in the historical struggles of man. It creates a partisanship toward the poor, the afflicted, and the humiliated.* When the church loses the courage to stand beside the poor and the powerless, it automatically becomes the religion of the rich and the mighty. God has chosen to accomplish his work of liberation and reconciliation by befriending the outcasts, by justifying the ungodly, and by ministering to the sick and hungry. The church should not pretend to stand above and apart from the conflicts between men. It must take sides. To refuse to do so is not to remain neutral but to stand by default on the side of the mighty. The proclamation of the gospel today involves collaboration with the poor and the oppressed.

The ministry of partisanship toward and collaboration with the oppressed is not the same as the politics of polarization pursued by both rulers and demagogues. These polarize in order to protect or advance their own narrow interests. As Jürgen Moltmann notes, the motto of all rulers who want to crush freedom is *divide et impera*, divide and rule. Christian collaboration with all who are oppressed does not aim to dominate by dividing. The poor are not befriended in order that the tables may be turned on the rich; the enslaved are not liberated in order that the masters may become slaves. Rather, the partisanship of the gospel for the poor and op-

pressed is also a partisanship for the humanity of the oppressor. The master is also a slave. He must also be liberated from his enslavement. When the church stands and fights on the side of the powerless and the needy, it acts not in a sectarian and separatist manner but out of an all-inclusive concern.

V

The collaboration of theology and the church with the spirit of liberation in the secular world today must certainly be a critical collaboration. To labor together as men involves mutual criticism. Only those who work together toward common goals can effectively criticize each other. Criticism by those uninvolved in the struggle is often rightly ignored.

The critical contribution of Christians to secular movements of liberation cannot be predicted in advance. Still, those who already participate to some extent in a new freedom in Christ may help to offset the inclination toward an inhuman futurism which is a recurrent temptation of the passionate secular quest for liberation. *The gospel proclaims the freedom of man as first of all a gift to be celebrated and only then a task to be accomplished.*

A purely future freedom is only an ideal which requires that man mortgage his present entirely for the sake of future freedom. The future then becomes a carrot held in front of a donkey. This produces motion but offers no satisfaction. In contrast to the idea of freedom as a carrot held forever in front of man, the New Testament proclaims that Christ has set us free. The freedom experienced in Christ is by no means complete, but it is real enough to celebrate.

The Christian community is a celebrating community. Its joy and festivity are not unrealistic. It does not underestimate the cruelty of the established powers nor does it overlook the cost which resistance to these powers always exacts. Still, Christians sing, dance and celebrate, not as something peripheral to their sense of identity and their vision of a coming new reality but as fundamental to it; not as something which they do only on specified occasions but as that act which best defines their life style.

Celebration expresses a basic affirmation of life, a sense of the trustworthiness of the ultimate power of human existence, a yes to the world and its still untapped possibilities. The Christian church celebrates with gusto because it knows of the great divine affirmation of man and the world in Christ.

Because the Christian celebrates so chronically, he is a poor risk both as a defender of the status quo and as a no-holds-barred revolutionary. The gospel strengthens man's freedom to laugh—both at the ridiculous “put-on” of the powers that be and at himself. In his new book, *Religion, Revolution and the Future*, Moltmann thanks American university students for helping to teach him that a sense of humor and festivity is an indispensable element in the struggle for freedom.

Laughter and legalism do not mix well. And legalism comes in many forms. There is the legalism of “law and order.” There is the legalism of “There's just no precedent for such an action, it's never been done before, it's completely unrealistic.” And there is also the legalism of “Tear down the

whole damn system." Revolutionaries are tempted to forget how to laugh and may become grim and inflexible. They may speak of the total corruption of "them" and of the total innocence of "us." This revolutionary self-righteousness can lead to a loss of maneuverability in one's efforts to transform human life and institutions and also to a reckless disdain for present man who is sacrificed on the altar of the new man

of the future. Like other legalisms, revolutionary grimness and rigidity cramp the human spirit. This defeats the very goal of liberation to which the ardent revolutionary aspires.

The gospel today will be timely, will be good news indeed only if it enables men to sing, laugh and dance in the midst of real conflict and struggle to help liberate men from all that enslaves and demeans him.

Ready or Not, Here They Come

by W. ROBERT MARTIN, JR.

I was asked to present this paper in an effort to take seriously the mind-set, visceral mummerings and expectations of students who are in their various approach patterns toward the seminaries of this land. I was assigned a title for this paper. It read, "The Student With Whom We Have To Do." . . . Jokingly, I am tempted to say that the title may well illustrate one of the contemporary crises confronting the homiletical task with which you have to deal! The theme with which I prefer to work is simply this, "Bum, Bum, Bum, Here They Come . . . Ready or Not!"

Now, if for various reasons you are not quite sure that you have found sufficient hiding places within the camouflage of curriculum, the precarious power of administration or the inviolateness of tenure, you have every reason to be frightened by their coming. You will have little option but to view students as nothing short of some "things" with which you must deal. If, on the other hand, you are excited by newness, curiosity and quest, you have every cause to celebrate their coming. You can look forward to the things that you together can unravel, piece together, confront and proclaim amid times such as these.

I shall attempt to address myself to the impressions I pick up from college and seminary students. I shall attempt

Paper presented before the annual meeting of the American Academy of Homiletics, December 6, 1969, by the Reverend W. Robert Martin, Jr., associate director of The Fund for Theological Education. An alumnus of Davidson College and Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., Mr. Martin has done graduate study in Edinburgh and Oxford.

to share some hunches as to what all it says about students themselves and then risk some hints as to what it all implies for you in the assignments that belong to your place within theological education. Hopefully this will set a context for open and forthright discussion about the matter before us.

I

Let me begin by letting the students speak for themselves. What you will hear now is a battery of quotations lifted out of applications for Rockefeller Trial Year Fellowships. These students have not been considering theological education as viable primarily because they had not been considering the ministry as a vocational possibility. I think you will be impressed, as am I, with the intensity of the spiritual quest, the seriousness of the intent to contribute to the forging of a more just and redeeming order and the willingness to be open to an entirely new vocational confrontation. If you are serious about being sensitive to the contemporary student, listen to what he says to you in his reflective moments:

"The decade of the sixties is beyond doubt a maelstrom epoch. The Vietnamese War, domestic racial unrest and global economic gyrations have increased the anxiety of the social

vice. As an often unwilling product of my times I stand partially mutilated before this social jetstream. My vocational alternatives for the future are both limited and distinct. Of course, every contemporary college graduate faces military service and its terse options of enlistment or induction. In addition, I am now probing the possibilities of graduate work in history or service in the Peace Corps. Yet, the future seems more inevitably constricted, perhaps as a product of my increased maturity or of unyielding events; but whether from emotional perception or growing social apocalypse, the future of 1969 seems decidedly dulled before the hopes of 1965."

"The Church's major problem lies in its ministry, for the viability of any organization is only measured by its human sinew. The ordained ministry today, like the church it serves, is both challenging and frustrating. Its frustrations are sounded in the ambitions of its bright young men who become blunted on the unfortunate machinations of church politics and finance. They sought a church of soul and self, and met with an emotionally bankrupt church suffering a self-identity crisis in a world no longer sympathetic to its anemic tendering. I fear eating this social acid and finding myself grown hollow inside. All young ministers of my acquaintance live under the shadow of this burdening bitterness as their idealism ruptures on reality."

"I would hope to accomplish four things in a year at seminary:

(1) reach a fuller understanding of

Christianity as seen in a broad historical perspective;

(2) unravel and answer some of the crucial questions and problems of my personal faith and come, thereby, to a greater understanding of the Christian Faith and myself;

(3) come to understand more fully the role of the Church and Ordained Ministry in society as regards their past history, present dilemma and their future possibilities for survival and viability;

(4) decide whether or not I should continue my studies in seminary, and try to learn whether or not the Ordained Ministry and I fit each other's pattern of demands."

"At present I would very much like to become immersed in an environment where my tediously formulated beliefs are severely questioned and examined. I wish to determine whether they can stand a stringent analysis. So far, I have come onto these things in a scientific atmosphere. My philosophy bears the imprint of a great struggle between scientific mechanism and religious mysticism. I would hope the experience would affirm or contest my conclusions. Besides using seminary for my own catharsis, I would like to see if the ministry is really a way to effect meaningful change. I would eagerly welcome a 'try-out.'"

"The Church, even in its apathy and neutrality, is a social and political force. Ideally it should be a critical force constantly calling to judgment institutions and actions that give priority to ideological, technological or financial considerations over the

needs of human life and happiness. It has a commitment to use its full powers to see that agapé and justice are the principles on which our corporate existence actually operates. There are wholly secular groups and anti-church individuals who are acting out of the same sort of values and I'm not yet sure what, if anything, differentiates the role of the 'Judaео-Christian' from that of the 'secular humanist,' though at times, in reading Buber, Tillich or Bonhoeffer, or in working with Professor 'X,' I sense that there might be a real and positive difference. I just don't know but I really want to find out."

"There is another field where the Church is the sole source of action. It is perhaps old-fashioned to believe that man has such a nebulous thing as a soul; and once so believing, it is absolutely archaic to believe that the soul needs ministering too. Forgive me, I so believe! The spiritual side of man's existence in these troubled, trying times is the Church's responsibility and obligation. Much of this aspect of the Church's function has been lost behind the headlines of secular action. But here, where men try to pray and need to know if there is someone or something that hears and knows their hopes and fears . . . here the Church must be a guide, an example, and an inspiration."

"The minister must be acutely aware of evil and the ambiguities of evil in the world. He must be a moral philosopher, a poet, an idealist at heart, an economic realist and a true and trustworthy friend. A minister, to be worthy of his name, must 'minister'

to his congregation . . . both social and spiritual. Of course, the minister's function does not end with his parish, but I have the distinct feeling that it must begin there."

"Halfway through college I became suddenly determined to lay hold of 'Truth and Faith' as if they were ripe apples. I chose the study of Philosophy and Religion as my vehicle. The quest was idiotic as defined and it was frustrating going, but it was also rewarding. I acquired a preoccupation with fundamental realities and principles which remains with me and plagues me today. I also became persuaded that religion in general and Christianity in particular are not silly constructions, as I had thought, because each of us actually does impose upon the world and upon himself a certain modest coherence and integrity through his stated, unstated or unthought beliefs. We all have our gods, and we had best choose them carefully. Perhaps I learned other things, but this seems to have been the most important."

"There is a lack of faith both inside and outside the Church. Like any societal institution, the Church responds to the felt needs of its congregants, who have not been asking loudly or explicitly for faith. Still, the need of faith is universal, and the Christian Church must minister to that need and provide a community for it. Christianity is no more archaic than the human condition; the problem is to interpret it comprehensibly. By historical accident, I belong to a Church which is notorious for its mutilations of Christian faith, but its

sister groups have not done much better. If lawyers can make the American Constitution relevant to a present necessity, churchmen should be able to do the same with the Gospel."

"Will the real Jesus please stand up! In the middle of all the critical and linguistic inquiry, I want to know if He is really in there somewhere. I feel alone amid the unending sea of nameless faces. Two hundred and fifty thousand of us went to Washington only to be told we don't matter. The business of killing will go on as usual. What good does the correction of water pollution do if we die in ten years from bad air? The sound of silence is deafening amid bombs, beeps and fizzing bromicides. I hunger to be alive among my fellow man and hope theological study and the men who teach it will be real to me and authentic with me."

Listen in on some different kind of statements. These are comments written by Trial Year Fellows at the end of that exploratory year in seminary. Their comments give clear, helpful and, sometimes, devastating critique on theological education and upon those of us who deal with it. See how well their expectation and realizations match up. Give a listen:

"In the work and worship experience at 'X' I have gained a much clearer understanding of what it means to be a Christian. That is, what the life of Christ means. What finally leaves me disturbed and restless at the end of this year, then, is that I cannot honestly say that I have seen the spirit of Christ in the Divinity School or in

any other 'Christian' institution with which I have come in contact this year. One clear example is the inability of the Church to move with the revolutionary cry for justice in our time for the poor and oppressed of the earth. We are bogged down in our own lack of vision, and fettered by our own financial ties. We have become the unhearing souls of Isaiah 6."

"I've honestly tried to untangle my motivations for rejecting the role of minister. I suppose central to my rejection is the belief that the Church as it currently stands is an inadequate medium for the spiritual cravings of myself and others of my age. Time after time this year, I have felt that I've had to sift through archaic jargon with ambiguous meanings and preposterously elaborate systems before arriving at the 'core' essence of religious thoughts. No doubt, some of my frustration stems from my background in Biology, where scientific method and public verification of theories are given. But more than just my scientific consciousness is involved here. The content of religious expression in the Christian Church is greatly prevented from reaching the spiritual cravings of me and my friends because of its form. I feel uneasy and restless when I attempt to think of ultimate concerns in Christian categories because I don't understand them with their historical background and because they are simply inadequate to guide me in my spiritual quest."

"But I need now to take another look at Christianity. The divine man, adop-

tionist theology, and the like confuse me. How much of the synoptic tradition do we view as apocalypticism and on what basis? These questions remain after a semester course of Johannean exegesis and a semi-audit of NT introduction. I mention them not as haunting problems but as questions that I will bring to the next NT course I take with a reasonable confidence that they can be answered or resolved."

"I had hoped to come out of this year knowing myself a good deal better and having a much clearer idea of my religious and vocational commitments. As a result of the Trial Year, my Christian commitment is stronger and better defined, although not hung up on some of the specific doctrines and rules as it was before. I now see Christianity as the opportunity to consent to God's power; and I believe that God is truly working a purpose in the world in which man can take part. The hopeful thing about the Judaeo-Christian tradition, it seems to me, is that no matter who he is or what he has been, man can consent to God. In this respect I have been influenced by reading Jonathan Edwards, by Professor 'X's' Theology course, and by 'X's' Old Testament course. I have come to see Christianity as a more radical commitment than before, one which demands complete giving and implies a reliance on values and power other than those of the everyday practical world.

"While my Christian commitment is stronger now, my vocational plans, as I mentioned, have not really taken shape."

"First, I have found that theology is my first love. I have taken a greater interest in, and enjoyed, this year of study more than I have anything since my classes with Professor 'X' at 'X.' I do, then, wish to keep theology at the center of my intellectual concerns. Second, however, I have decided that the particular nature of my interests can be fulfilled in a Ph.D., rather than a B.D. program. My interest, I have come to see, is primarily with the academic intellectual side of theology, rather than with its ministerial, vocational side. That is to say, I would like ultimately to *teach theology*, rather than be a *minister*."

"The Church of today, too often joined by the seminaries, has become fearful of being powerfully humble and disruptively prophetic. In this regard I have been awakened by the writings of Walter Rauschenbusch in 'X's' Theology course. His fifty-year-old critiques of the Church, which he constantly contrasts with the Kingdom, have not lost their bite. And the Church has generally lived down to his indictments of its irrelevance in a troubled world. Similarly, I am drawn by the words of both Jesus and Rauschenbusch which speak to personal suffering which cannot be alleviated by mere sheer social engineering. If anything, my flickering religious faith has been revived a great deal by this kind of stripping away of the churchly veneer which distorts and hides the hard ethical and evangelical core of the faith."

"The impact of this year on my Christian development has been invigoratingly ambiguous. I find myself at

times being more confidently critical of Christianity than I ever was before. And yet, at other times I find that I can accept Christianity and that my acceptance is more balanced in judgment, richer, deeper, and more mature than it ever was before."

"I believe much of our practice has been constructed on poor theology, canned theology, or no theology largely because we have failed to be creative theologians and skillful practitioners (in the parish or wherever) at the same time. I suppose we have always said that and usually placed the blame on the men in the field for being unable to apply theology; but I do not think that is the whole story. In fact, I think the real issue is that we have not trained and helped men to generate theology (i.e. to think anew theologically every step of the way). So on one hand we have men who are simply re-heating the theology they were given back in their seminary days; and on the other hand (and I believe this is greatly the case in my generation) we have men who created or appropriated theological positions either to fulfill an identity crisis during the seminary days or to be relevant to the hottest closest issue. The dilemma of the latter case is similar to that of the former; what do you do when the issue is no longer your identity-crisis or the issue that was hot for you in seminary. Please do not get me wrong. I believe that 'theological consumption' and 'identity and issue relevancy' are important components of a theological education; my point is that they do not, however, constitute theological thinking. And that is

precisely the issue that intrigues me. Thus my ministry must either entail helping men to think theologically (which I think means involvement in the field of theological education) or to think theologically myself (which means areas other than education *per se*)."

II

I turn now to "buy in" with some hunches that I broker from these poignant statements of students. Also I will attempt to draw upon reflections derived from conversations with students around the country, as well as put to the pen some feelings and memories that spring to focus from my years as Dean of Students at Union Seminary in Virginia. I am fully aware that the previous quotations will not illustrate nor will my comments touch on all the differing personalities within your student-bodies. I would hope, however, this will all be helpful in an over-view and in appreciation of and sensitizing to the students you already have as well as those students who will be coming to your school for study this next academic year.

Here are some of my "hunches" about this generation of students:

This student generation represents the first generation which has had no real intellectual adolescence. Physically and emotionally they must traffic the same maturation calendar. Intellectually, however, they have moved from "Captain Kangaroo" to "Dark Shadows," from "The Wizard of Oz" to "Meet the Press" in two giant steps with little time lag in between. It is acutely difficult to accommodate emotionally and vocationally the knowl-

edge that they acquire in ever increasing amounts and at an increasingly earlier age.

They lean toward the future for the authentication of their goals and turn less and less to the past for the validation of their aspirations, formation of attitudes and stimulus for their activities.

Their feelings of anger, hostility, frustration and futurelessness are very real. They are intensified when "adults" dismiss those moods as simply more illustrations of infantile temper tantrums of the "Spock generation."

The times force them into a desperate, dead-serious and, more than often, profound creativeness. Some people like to categorize this disposition as "nowness." They are refusing to view time as just "chronos." Rather, they see time as "kairos." They see the present as an epoch, an event, that requires and gives mandate for specific response of personal and corporate vulnerability. When they look about and see power structures that range from military-industrial complex; higher education; The Church, etc. being owned by "chronos" they despair. To plan for the future in the midst of that context appears to be nothing more than an exercise of cynical masochism.

Whereas most of us feel "guilt" concerning the affairs of society and the Church, they feel mostly "embarrassment" for us. Therefore, they approach issues and ideas from quite different contexts with radically differing stakes and expectations.

They move with relentless search for self-identity. They opt for sincerity over against respectability. They opt for integrity over against superficial acceptability. They are therefore teachable but quite on guard for canned indoctrination.

We are quick to brand any radical activity within the student generation "violence." Many would answer us with the response that the activity illustrates "counter-violence"! In an age that has chosen to use physical, economic, political, racial and intellectual violence at all levels of its life, "counter-violence" is the only option to effect change rather than gentle reform, the only alternative to force into life a new page to be written rather than a "scissor and paste" job on an already ragged page in history.

A paradox: they trust no one over thirty as far as rhetoric goes. At the same time they choose to identify most of their models from that "un-young" generation . . . Cox, Coffin, Cleaver, Eliade, Marcuse, McLuhan, Kierkegaard, Tillich, Bonhoeffer, King, Kennedy, McCarthy, Rauschenbusch . . . to name but a few.

There is a readiness, some realized . . . some not, to be "involved" with societal issues coupled to a hunger to acquire religious insight. Yet, there is a strange reticence to be "implicated" by religious identification. That disposition to say little can be expressed many ways . . . "fear of pious trap," "genuine timidity about the unknown," "not intellectually respectable and/or politically wise" or just "general embarrassment."

They are moving through some real generational shifting and real generationally self-imposed legalism. The "youth" or "counter" culture is strangely committed to a style of rigid puritanical secularism. For example, in my day, to "do" certain things was branded a "sin" and the consequences were intimidating. Today, "not to do" is branded as being "up tight," a fate worse than "sin," just as intimidating and equally rigid in expectation.

Within the last months students have moved from "other directed" activism to stances of "activistic privatism." Quickly the ground has shifted from the rumblings of massive and unified protest to personal acts of commitment and vulnerability to discovery and participation in a wider community. Over against a Harvard, Columbia or Berkeley riot, you now have a Woodstock and a Washington Moratorium that served more as lightning rods for personal expressions of concern, discontent, and celebration.

Many students are approaching theological education initially for vocational reasons. These reasons are "life-style" reasons. They are not vocational reasons of professional consequences. They want to know what's it all about rather than simply beginning straight away to prepare for ordination.

They do not need professors to force secular moments on them exclusively. They quest after theological clues that will make their personal or vicarious secular experiences gain new perspective. They are not against having their subjective priorities re-arranged provided the things they see and hear make sense.

When the "fat is off the bone" my hunch is that students are approaching theological education with an ache for the experience to be something like a sensitive, responsible and responsive graduate-level "inquirers" laboratory! How about that?

They come expecting seminary to be a "caring community" to them in the same way that supposedly that community is committed to training them to "care" for others "out yonder."

They come knowing that there are no "sure bets" within any institutional framework that will guarantee them the freedom to "do their own thing." Therefore, the Church is not as readily dismissed as it was in the mid-60's nor is the Ministry as quickly ruled out as it was even eighteen months ago. History, I think, will show that the last Presidential campaign, conventions and the new administrative pronouncements (including "effete snobs") have served as the main negative inputs that have now created much more realistic and positive change in perspective about Church and Ministry.

They are in search for persons who are gripped by Kierkegaard's "passion for the possible." They are on a search for persons who will stay with them in the exploration as to how minds and structures can be opened up to entertain new possibilities and new redeeming hopefulness with "liberty and justice for all."

Seldom do they charge the Church and those of us associated with it, with the "sin of commission." They

hound the Church and will have no hesitancy to hound us with our "sins of omission."

Due to a rapidly approaching emotional and intellectual fatigue, many students may well be standing on the brink of adopting a wild new form of very rigid piety. It is already happening in the under-graduate campuses of leading universities and the seminaries will be affected accordingly. Not that the students prefer this move. They do not "enjoy" a theological posture that is "right-wing" religiosity and self-righteous in flavor and highly individualistic in scope. But, when their inquiries to so-called "liberal" minds are met by self-protective responses like, "but on the other hand" they freeze. They are then tempted and are being seduced in weariness to grab after catechetical formulas of pedestrian theology. As Bill Coffin put it so clearly during a sermon at Princeton Chapel, "You hate the bad, refuse to love the good and become nothing more than damn good haters."

These students ache for hope in an era that appears to them to be running out of the luxury of more time. They do not ask of us, therefore, "How?" They ask the larger and more important question of us. The question is simply this . . . "How come?" The declination of that question is also simple in implication . . . "How come you do what you do?" "How come we should believe that?" "How come the Church and how come ordination?" "How come a man should preach, already?"

My last comments in this section are not hunches. They are affirmations. These are precious persons who yearn to shape the future in hope by their engagements in the present. I celebrate the fact that it will be to this present student generation that our two young sons will be turning for leadership and for the fashioning of their hope in the years of their emergence into adulthood. If the Church has the courage, the integrity and the sensitivity to lay claim to this student generation, the Church will continue to have life and will have increased its capacity to speak to the world through its leadership.

III

Let me turn now from "hunches" about students to "hints" as to what all this may imply for you within your discipline and for us in the fashioning of our own ministry to students.

You are freed by these students. If you have felt "isolated" and "set apart," you can now rejoice in the fact that "isolation" and "set-apartness" are the last things students want, need or will permit. Because you have chosen professionally to water at the trough of theological education as professors, students expect you to really be "onto" some things real and vital. They expect you to have accommodated some "faith stuff" yourselves in both gut and mind. They also expect you to have a perspective as to how it all relates to the world. They expect you to set them onto a context of study and work that is far more than just a three or four year anthropological "right of passage" experience. They want a piece of your convictions and cues as to how you work at a viable posture of faith. They

are not at all against hard-nosed intellectual inquiry but they want to know its place on the spectrum of your theological validation. This implies letting them see the underpinnings of your own tasks that justify the time and energy spent within those tasks. If these personal engagements, convictions and ambiguities are withheld from them, don't be shocked when your academic conclusions go unheard and unheeded. If, however, these matters are shared in rigorous intellectual grappling and vulnerable personal engagement, they will be the first to join with you in celebration and in expectation!

You are fully aware of the galaxy of criticisms aimed at theological education. It may well be that preoccupation with "beefing up" intellectual respectability of communicative and homiletical reflection places it before such disdain. Objective theological critiques of societal ills and political foibles are being pelted with marshmallow accusations of spiritual bankruptcy. Often times the commitment to "doing in" the ol' line piety has been so intense that our over-reaction has created a vacuum of real "dis-commitment" to anything that might be identified as religious. Those who come under the theological roof are quickly aware that you may well be seeking to prepare them for a task about which you yourselves are very unclear. They sense that you may well have no working definition of Ministry with which to work yourselves. They perceive you seek to train them for a vocational task within an institution that claims little of your primary interest unless the constituency fails to contribute sufficiently to provide you with annual salary hikes. They sense you

seek to "send them forth" to announce, proclaim and celebrate from a basic commitment that appears to hold minimal priority in the life-style they see you having in their presence, to say nothing of the life-style they see you having with your colleagues!

What can be done? Do you make isolated attempts at a new theology? Do you simply re-define the role of communication and/or preaching? Do you give new form to your courses alone? Do you simply perform curricula transplantation? Often change has been adolescent attempts to be "popular" rather than "significant." Often we have made desperate leaps at being "with it" rather than attempting to give serious and forthright energy to be active in the learning process of faith and practice, of proclamation and instruction, of dialogue and reflection. Any intellectual and contextual pursuit on your part must engage both you and your students subjectively as well as objectively. They deserve and are capable of being more than passive recipients of "Holy Knowledge."

You stand before the mandate to activate the un-used power that is found in religious consciousness to re-form and re-create. You are understood, more than others, to be the "professional practitioners of Sustaining Word." Now, I do not know whether or not that causes you to be pleased, flinch or want to retch, but there it is. Students are laymen who have wandered into a theological school. They don't "know no better" nor do they let you go free on this one. Therefore, you stand in a strategic location within a theological faculty. You can take the lead in the address of tasks and possibilities rather

than merely giving form to expounding positions that need to be adopted. The Christian life, as I understand it, is not the business of maintaining a well-documented net-work of powerfully impenetratable data as much as it is a style of pursuit done with theological intelligence and human integrity. The minister becomes the "enabler" of such pursuit-style. Preaching and teaching does not then become or remain a position of fortress. Rather, your exciting task is to enable students to come onto the vulnerability to entertain and pursue realities and possibilities. You can enable them to be freed up to chase after the "not yet," the "yet to be experienced," without the need to have a cautiously documented justification or doctrinaire compulsiveness to dogmatize the future! You are in a crucial spot to meet them here and to lead them far down the road of religious liberation and professional competency. In a real way you stand as the coordinator of their theological education. Stop feeling sorry for yourselves and stop feeling peripheral in that total process. (I realize this may be like telling an alcoholic all he needs to do is stop drinking!) You can be key factors to

assist students in real interior clarification that will enable them to take the relevance and communication of the Gospel seriously.

These students are far too perceptive, far too hungry, and far too creative for you to spend energy trying to instruct them how to gesture, joke and juxtapose in three point rhythm. With every confidence I have, I am certain that you can meet them where they are and as they are. You can provide them with the "how come" of Good News for themselves and for their fellow man that will allow them to get on with the work at hand with eagerness and with a sense of purpose. "Bum, bum, bum, here they come . . . ready or not!" Be ready and waiting for them, not as professors who cannot be out-foxed or as professors who simply screw up their professional courage to meet the next bunch with whom you have to deal. Rather, be unafraid to be theological friends to them. Don't apologize for expecting much and requiring genuine engagement. Don't be ashamed to be busy at Ministry to these students through the sensitive handling of your tasks and via the continuous quest upon which they see you set.

(This article is dedicated to the continuation of the personal and professional style set by William Walter Johnson—January 6, 1929-March 7, 1970—Associate Professor of Homiletics, Austin Theological Seminary. Part of my confidence in the task of the homiletical professor is firmly grounded in the knowledge of this man who, as a professor, was unafraid to be a theological friend to his students, unapologetic in expecting much and requiring genuine engagement, and unashamed to be busy at ministry to his students, his colleagues, and to the wider Church. W.R.M.)

Adults in Crisis

by JAMES E. LODER

I THINK Dr. Bonnell was the first one who introduced to me the area of "the cure of souls" in a course by that name. If nothing else, this lecture may be taken as an expression of my gratitude for his teaching and for his contributions to the combined fields of religion and psychology. Later on I want to make specific reference to a critical episode presented to a class where I sat as his student. However, before going into that, I want to define my terms and set forth a general problem in the area of human development in our society.

I. *The Terms and the Problem*

I was asked to speak on the topic, "Adults in Crisis." This will not be a discussion of case histories; it will be an analysis of some dimensions in the crisis of human development during what we may still call the middle years, let's say 33 and thereafter until retirement. The major crisis during this period is, according to Erik Erikson, a matter of choosing between generativity or stagnation. The strength which emerges on the positive side of this choice, he says, is the capacity to care; so I will call this the crisis of caring.

My interpretation of this is, based on Erikson and others, that these are the years when a demand is made by the

In 1966 the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, established The John Sutherland Bonnell Lectureship in Pastoral Psychology. The 1969 lecturer was James E. Loder, associate professor of Christian Education, Princeton Theological Seminary. Professor Loder holds the Ph.D. degree from Harvard University Graduate School and is the author of Religious Pathology and Christian Faith (Westminster, 1966).

younger generation against the older. The demand is a two-edged sword: they would wrest the power from the adult "establishment" in return for which they would also like to receive the full blessing and support of those same adults. The older generation has, or so it thinks, the choice to accept, reject, or split the demand, i.e. surrendering the power but withholding the blessing or bestowing the blessing but withholding the power. This is a cross-cultural type of struggle and has probably existed in some form from the primal horde down to the present.

My impression is that this situation at the present in American society is not unique because of any new elements in the crisis itself. There are perhaps more irreversible decisions which can now be made on the part of wayward youth due to drug usage, and on the other hand some conditions of emotional illness which were once thought to be irreversible now can be improved. There are variables of this kind, but the critical variable seems to be the fact that the same elements persist in a crisis which is greatly prolonged, and as a consequence normal conflict between the generations is greatly intensified in our society and the principal parties are more rigidly polarized.

In order to bring the picture into a

sharp focus, I will use a modified model of neurotic interaction. This will not, of course, cover every situation, but it will be close enough to the center to catch some of the dynamics. In this neurotic interaction model the younger generation suffers from the ambivalence of openness. The evidence for the ambivalence is the self-righteousness with which openness is demanded. Specifically, there is the demand for an unrestricted right just to be worth something without having to achieve it. This is coupled with the persistent protest against the Protestant ethic as unethical. There is the more patent ambivalence associated with the blurring of the conventional lines between the sexes. Also note with McLuhan that the openness which craves participatory democracy also demands participatory speech; that is, there is an in-language of openness which keeps changing and you have to "groove" with it or be closed out. Of course, the most prominent symbol of openness is nudity—not really a very new thing—but, as has frequently been pointed out, none of this contemporary "exposure" is for sheer fun or much enjoyed. It all has a deep-running moral purpose: namely, to open up and liberate the "establishment" from its hypocrisy. This moral purpose is hedged about and running over with anxious fear of set-patterning lest it become oppressive; yet nothing is more oppressive than the self-righteousness which underlies the quest for a liberated openness. The demand seems to be: "Give us the freedom we cannot give ourselves, but do it without being yourself and do it with our full knowledge of every phase; and, incidentally, don't forget to give us credit for it when it comes about."

The ambivalence of close-minded openness has been intensified in our society by the prolonged moratorium on identity solutions and the rise of the increasingly popular idea of the protean man as an alternative to a situation in which the younger generation sees no viable adult model.

The older generation, on the other hand, suffers from the ambivalence of closure. This seems to me more complex, so I will take it up summarily from just three standpoints: two focal areas in social psychological research and an historical perspective. The first body of research is that which was done on the authoritarian personality in which it was pointed out that persons who were conventionalistic, close-minded, given to stereotyping and projectivity (tended to believe that wild and dangerous things were going on in the world) often had deep-running sexual ambivalences. Thus, the really strong man who is appealing rigidly to law and order is himself aware, perhaps only at some latent level, of a desire to act out in the same fashion as the younger generation. This forces him under stress to be all the more rigid. I don't think I need to develop at length the point that this particular personality syndrome functions well in certain positions of authority where the issues are black and white and scapegoating is in order. Interpreting beyond this research I would say, in the past the blacks have been the scapegoat; now as if to identify with the aggressor, the militant blacks scapegoat the "establishment."

The second body of research refers to the achievement motive in which the necessity to achieve in order to be worth something grows out of middle and up-

per middle-class family patterns in which there is early independence training, great competitive struggle in school for academic distinction and a grand push for top college placement. Among these persons, who are particularly well-suited to the ways of the American establishment, there is another kind of ambivalence (which often gives rise to ulcers). In these same achievement-oriented persons there is a repressed desire for ascriptive warmth, a home, and particularly for a non-competitive mother who would not make the young man or woman earn his kisses and hugs.

I am suggesting against both these types of personality syndromes, which syndromes seem reasonably prevalent in the "establishment," that the new free youth movement is a dramatic polarization. The youth seem to be claiming and living out the very things which the "establishment" has denied itself in order to get ahead; on the other hand, the youth seem to be latently reflecting a desire to *be* the establishment as evidenced by their own ambivalence, particularly their covert oppressiveness.

The key factor of our current historical situation is a prolongation of the crisis which implicitly seems to justify the free youth position. Most of those who now run the "establishment" were old enough to know what America accomplished through careful planning, self-denial, unquestioned patriotism and tremendous technological efforts before the watershed year of 1945. They saw it work to win World War II. But the undergraduates of today, most all born since 1945, have never seen the "establishment" solve any of the major problems which have arisen since then. In

1945 we won the war and used nuclear power to exterminate two Japanese cities. In 1945 we assumed the position of the major world power and inherited from Western Europe the responsibility for world order and the new development of Western Civilization. In 1945 Soviet Russia emerged as the other great power in the world. By 1945 the Communist revolution in China was burgeoning, and we have seen only the mildest expressions of that threat in Korea and Viet Nam. Firm groundwork for the critical Supreme Court decision of 1954 was laid by the integration of Armed Forces which took place in 1945. And finally, the year 1945 marked the year in which the technological and economical revolutions in America began and which brought us to the present state of scientific knowledge and affluence.* If the younger generation is unconvinced by the life style of the "establishment," I think we may also be sure that the system has lost some confidence in itself. The affluence which the technological and economic revolutions have created is clearly not a solution to any of the great moral issues of our time. Moreover, in a society where "bread is" we are not about to simply resolve our differences in order to get back to earning our bread. The common enemy of potential starvation can no longer unite us. In the absence of the enemy we turn our hostilities more directly upon each other; this bodes well for a *real* solution since the real combatants are more likely to meet face to face. As that popular philosopher, Linus, put it, "We have met the enemy and it is US."

* *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1966, p. 154f.

I have set up the problem as a neurotic cycle, but obviously most of the persons involved are not being treated for a neurosis. By this I do not mean to say merely this is a neurotic society or some other negative platitude like that. I mean to say that the pattern of interaction is destructive to both parties involved. Moreover, it will repeat itself, not just as the generations repeat themselves but, given the situation I have described, there will be with each generation an increasing magnification of the intensity of the interaction and the polarization. This, I think, is the crisis of caring. It is not only a matter concerning our own children and whether they will be a credit to us, but a question of whether we can care enough about their children—the ones we have not even seen yet—to face and to work through the still-manageable problems we most certainly have now with our own children—the ones we see all too often, but never very clearly.

I turn now to the religious dimensions of this cycle and the way in which it seems to contribute more to the crisis than to the caring.

II. *A Religious Dimension*

In the total complex of factors involved in such a cycle, I want to focus on one which is not only of special importance for this occasion but which I believe is of ultimate significance for the attainment of a satisfactory resolution. This is the factor of a rise in reductionistic secularism which characterizes our time.

Much evidence of this could be given, but I will just note that studies of the rise of secularism among college-age persons indicate that secularism in our

time is repeating itself and it is now at a height unknown in America since the 1920's to the 1930's. The causes for this may be debatable but the modern day decline in commitment to our tradition, I believe, can be described as the triumph of the reality principle. You will recognize this as a fundamentally Freudian notion. Since Freud himself was not too clear in what he meant by this, I will take the liberty of saying how I take it, i.e., what it is and how it operates in the secularization process. Primarily, the reality principle depends upon a well-structured, de-centered or objectified view of space and time within the ego. This well-structured ego recognizes and adopts established social and institutional patterns—and roles within those patterns—by means of which spontaneity and affect can be controlled. Finally, there is the philosophically dubious but nevertheless functional assumption that a good fit between established social patterns and this structured ego is the norm of sanity.

The secularization process may then be described as the reduction of Christian beliefs and practices to conformity with the reality principle. In the secularization mind-set we want a sane religion; in the face of neurotic interaction among the generations we want to sacralize sanity—to preserve sanity somehow. We want a religion that is in principle predictable and in which conformity to well-established socialized religious patterns is canonical. The logic of secularization is, of course, absurd. One must envision at the far end of such a process a totally computerized situation in which theological thinking, hoping, and believing are all programmed into the operation. A research

director from one of the RCA laboratories described this to me once and argued that this was to be the final stage of man. The human body, not being able to stand atomic fallout, would soon be extinct and the survival of the "human" would depend upon our ability to program the intrinsically human, including the religious, aspects of man, and to preserve these in a self-perpetuating machine. While the absurdity of this may be patent, I will just take it seriously long enough to note that a master chess player can still beat a computer, and I would argue along with those who say he can do this precisely because he has a body and that he can, so to say, intuit through his body and its extensions patterns of interaction far more complex and flexible than could be programmed. You may think of this what you like, but it seems to me that if chess is presently beyond the computer, I do not foresee the far greater complexity of religious belief with its inherent claims to novelty as apt to be reproduced in the likes of RCA labs.

If the logic of secularization and conformity to the reality principle has its absurdity, it is also true that the total abandonment of that principle in religious belief and practice is absurd. I remember a case which came up while I was studying at the Menninger Foundation in which a woman paralyzed by her mental illness was arrested for praying nude in her garden. The psychiatrist in charge, knowing that I was a religious type, asked me why this was not a new Joan of Arc. I said, in effect, that there was in this tragic case a complete loss of touch with the reality principle. This, I think, was essentially the answer, but it failed, as the training psy-

chiatrist pointed out to me, to give much of a constructive account of the relation of the reality principle and religious belief. Abandonment of the reality principle is absurd, even tragic, but much more must be said about what religious belief does to the reality principle.

What follows is a partial answer to this problem and the consequences of such an answer for the adult crisis of caring which I have described above. However, before going on to a development of this answer, let me summarize the major aspects of the problem as I have set it forth: First, in speaking of the crisis of caring, we are speaking of a developmental problem which appears more or less in every culture; essentially it is how to lose power and at the same time bestow blessing on the up-coming winners, the next generation. Second, this developmental inevitability is exaggerated as a problem by certain very common but inadequate patterns of socialization. Third, these patterns of socialization are called into question by historical circumstances, especially developments since 1945. Fourth, the contexts of technology and affluence contribute aggravation to the problem. Fifth, the Christian alternative is emasculated by a secularism which essentially puts the church in the position of sacralizing the conditions of the problem rather than offering a context for its resolution. Finally, I said I thought a key issue at stake here was the relation between religious belief, Christian faith specifically, and the reality principle. What I wish to turn to now is what it might mean to radicalize the reality principle, without

computerizing it on the one hand, or abandoning it on the other.

III. *Toward Solution*

My point of departure here is a case presented to a class entitled "The Cure of Souls" at Princeton Seminary. There I sat as a student as Dr. Bonnell was lecturing. He told how one night he was working late in his office when suddenly something prompted him to call a woman who was a member of his congregation. He simply sensed that she was in trouble. When he finally reached her, he learned that at the moment of his calling she had been contemplating suicide. The call and the subsequent conversation were able to avert the tragedy.

Instances like this, of which there are many more than most persons have the courage to admit (especially in a secularized society and church) obviously raise many more questions than I can answer. However, this does seem to me to focus the issue of the reality principle and religious belief, in particular the Christian faith, very sharply.

Freud did us a great service in demonstrating with infinite care what kind of religion was neurotic and did indeed need the instructive and corrective power of the reality principle. By this he did not condemn all religion to illness as he thought he did, but he helped us to refine with less confusion exactly how it is that authentic religious belief radicalizes the reality principle; he thereby helped us to draw a more clear-cut line between authentic and unauthentic expressions of the Christian faith by showing us more clearly what was unauthentic. But he left undone an account of authentic religious belief

which is yet something more than simply a secularization of a faith. My premise is that Dr. Bonnell's experience affords some direction in saying what radicalization of the reality principle—that is, neither neurotic nor secularized—might be.

There is involved in this episode a radical view of space and time. Space collapses, not merely to the extent of letting Dr. Bonnell be in the same room with the suffering woman, but he actually was able to enter her lived-space. Time was also radicalized; it was no longer a question whether he was working late in the chronological sense; the monotonous rhythm of homogeneous, objective time was suddenly, radically relativized to a dramatic sense of this being the "ripe" time, the critical moment, the fullness of time.

It seems to me that in Jesus' physical odyssey on earth we have the perfect paradigm for peace and time thrown into radical perspective. Do you realize what he did to the Judaic view of space? He revealed the timeless, unlimitable faceless Yahweh within the limits of a man's height, starting in the even more diminished space of a womb. He expanded into the unlimited life-space of God, claiming that he was at one with the Father. This claim puts into perspective his apparent capacity to expand or extend himself almost without limit into the lived-space of other people. You will remember this is what he did when he called Nathaniel. You will recall that he saw Nathaniel sitting under a tree far away in terms of objective space, but Jesus was apparently no further away than Nathaniel's own heart because he knew that he was an "Israelite without guile." When the right time

came, "his time" he called it, he shrank to the dimensions of a dead body, and then he completely disappeared, but only to re-appear in a fashion which permitted him to occupy the lived-space of others with or without the objective space so basic to the reality principle. Then, again at the right time, he disappeared by going "up." And we say that was it: the beginning and the end revealed in one abbreviated lifetime.

Whatever you may want to say exegetically, it is perfectly evident that Jesus paradigmatically radicalized the spatio-temporal world of his followers. The Christian life-space is not strictly bound by objective or practical space; it can take it or leave it. The Christian does not have the "correct time" perhaps, but he knows what time it is in the lives of men.

Now, I don't think this is mere theological extrapolation. Let me take just the spatial dimension to illustrate what I mean. We all know the phenomenon of the woman who can extend the sense of her body's height to include the feather—or some more fashionable equivalent—that extends upward from her hat—she can duck just enough to miss the top of the door without stopping to measure. We do the same thing when we park an automobile. We do not measure the room; we must, so to say, extend ourselves into space to make the car fit. Studies of violent men suggest that there is an area of about three feet surrounding such a person as a shell. To step within that shell is to force the violence to the surface; fists clench, pulse rate increases and so on. Anthropologist F. T. Hall argued that we all have our own space bubble, a lived-space which we demand as hu-

man beings in order to live. Forced into crowded conditions we become violent or deeply depressed. Studies being done at the World Council of Churches in Geneva last year were suggesting that the rate of suicide in Geneva could be positively correlated with the small cramped quarters in which people were so often forced to live. This lived-space seems to expand under positive conditions of elation and to contract with disappointment or depression.

This is to say that lived-space is not a given; it is something we intend, something of us which we compose and comport ourselves within. It is not something to which we are innately condemned. Rather, what we learn and come to believe about ourselves, our bodies, our social existence, indeed, our total belief system, is the basis of the lived-space we compose and preserve with our very lives. We compose lived-space in relation to but not necessarily dependent upon objective space. Because we compose lived-space even in the most natural sense on the basis of our *belief* about the spatio-temporal dimensions—and I would say also all the major social dimensions of our existence such as the sexual, the symbolic, and the authoritative are similarly composed—it is possible to suggest the following notions with reference to the specific belief system we call the Christian faith.

The Christian faith claims that the mind which was in Christ Jesus can also be in us, if we will let it. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 2:5). This means that if we will let the mind of Christ Jesus be in us, then his paradigmatic radicalization of the reality principle is

not merely a theological construct but is actually formative of our own lived-space, time, and sexuality.

Norrmann O. Brown once wrote on the abolishment of the reality principle to say that "it is possible to be mad and to be unblest; but it is not possible to get the blessing without the madness; it is not possible to get the illuminations without the derangement." This is the poetry of a Dionysian, yet it comes close to what I want to say, dangerously close, but the difference is crucial. I am saying one must be blest *before* he can have the madness, the paradigmatic madness, that radicalizes the reality principle. The blessing consists of receiving a new mind—a radical mind—the mind of Christ.

Now the crucial point in regard to Dr. Bonnell's experience is this. The relation between him and his counselee was care and cure, both coming from the Latin "*cura*," as Dr. Bonnell was the first to point out to me. The reality principle can be radicalized—notice I do not say abandoned—in the name of care. This, it seems to me, is the crux of the Christological paradigm: all the radicalization of reality characteristic of the mind of Christ, as exhibited in Jesus, is for the sake of the care and cure of souls. The reality principle can be radicalized—that is to say, you can take it or leave it and re-compose the world along entirely new lines, without either neurosis or sterility if it is in the name of care. Failing this centrality of caring, radicalization is probably the "madness" without the blessing and foredoomed to destroy itself.

Now we have come full circle. We have seen the adult crisis of our time as a crisis in caring, and we have said that

the crisis feeds on the secularization of Christian faith, a reduction of its claims to the terms of the reality principle. On the other hand, we have seen that the *self-understanding* of the Christian faith, revealed paradigmatically in the caring, curing person of Jesus Christ, radicalizes the reality principle, transforming it from a necessity to a live option. Such radicalization means for us that once we are blest, the dimensions of existence can be radically re-composed according to the caring, curing mind of Christ. "Let this mind be in you . . .," but there is the rub; how do you "let" the reality principle be radicalized? Where is the hinge between our contemporary frustration of caring and the promise of care and cure in the mind of Christ?

IV. *The Option to Create*

To begin with, this letting the reality principle be radicalized is for adults only, i.e., psychologically mature persons who are committed to a Christological interpretation of their maturity as being constantly in the process of unfolding.

In the second place, the notion of Christ's mind in us should force us to consider very seriously the presuppositional view of Henri Bergson, C. D. Broad and others, that the function of the brain (especially its more advanced centers) and the nervous system and the sense organs—the bio-physical basis of the reality principle—is in the main *eliminative* and not productive. The function of the brain and nervous system is to protect us from being overwhelmed by something C. D. Broad called Mind at Large. Or in terms of the Christian belief system, once we are

blest, the reality principle permits a measly trickle of the caring Mind of Christ to flow into our awareness, but it eliminates most of it to protect us from too much of the Divine. In a secularized society, we can stand just so much of the holy and no more.

The particular question about the hinge of care concerns Mind at Large, focused for our thinking here as the Christ, who expands our lived-space into dimensions far beyond our perception and more deeply than we can conceptualize into the lived-space of others. What is the connection of this Mind to the conflict which constitutes the contemporary crisis of the generations?

My concluding comments on this question are taken in part from a study which was banned in New York and published in Boston—to reverse a trend. Care and cure of this crisis, whether it appears concretely between father and son, mother and daughter, teacher or president and students, necessitates that one or the other break the cycle by first seeing it and then choosing not to respond according to form. I am counting on the adults to do this—but I may say “adult” could be re-defined as the one who does it. To move beyond the resulting frustration, anxiety and anger, one must meet the conditions of every creative act if he wants something new to emerge. Here I turn to the study by Pettigrew and Pajonas* for a statement of those conditions and the fashion in which they liberate a relationship. First of all, one must disavow any complete submission to authority; that is, the adult must submit to the possibility that youth may be correct and to the proposition that the only authority that either one can take seriously is the mutual

respect that they may create between them. The second premise is that if something new is to be created, there must be a willingness to enter into and sustain a concern for complexity, in particular the complexity of ambivalent feelings and the necessity for continued ambiguous statements and commitments in the relations between age groups. The point is not to simplify the matter and find out who is to blame; it is rather to be in and endure the situation in as many of its aspects as possible. The third premise is that one must be willing to have and to endure some psychic stress; to hope to resolve matters pleasantly is simply a refusal to resolve matters at all. The fourth premise is that one must be willing to accept the non-rational aspects of himself. He must be open to his own feelings without submitting to them and be willing to learn about himself by looking at, without being overwhelmed by, his fantasies and speculations. Finally, he must be willing to accept and live with wide divergences among persons; individual differences must be acceptable as an outcome. I am saying that creativity in a relationship is maximized when these conditions prevail; or, to put it in terms I used above, these conditions “let” the mind of Christ make things new; maximize the trickle of Christ-mindedness and lets it begin to flow.

Finally, we may come to this conclusion. The crisis of care in adulthood is also a critical opportunity for the in-

* Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Pajonas, Patricia J., “Social Psychological Considerations of Racially-Balanced Schools” published in *Because It is Right—Educationally*, Board of Christian Commonwealth of Massachusetts, April 1965.

corporation of the Christian faith. Neurosis is flight from that faith; so is secularization. The issue is whether the Christian faith will be polarized and petrified into an ideology designed to rationalize stagnation, or will it be the living ground and resource of continual creativity, the expanding of consciousness and the resolution of conflict. I suggest that if it is to be the latter, the Church must supply a context in

which the reality principle can be radicalized continually, a context in which we can celebrate our common creative duality, having a Mind that is ours yet not ours alone, and living in a Newtonian world without believing that it is definitive of reality-as-lived.

This, then, is my closing prayer in the face of the crisis of caring:

"Twofold Always. May God us keep
From single vision and Newton's sleep."

Thoughts on Liberation: James Reeb and Herbert Marcuse

by PAUL VERGHESE

IT IS A special honor you have done me in asking me to deliver the James Reeb Memorial lecture. I have few qualifications to merit it. I knew him, but not well. For a year, i.e., 1952-53, my first and his last at Princeton Seminary, we were schoolmates. But he was then a married student living off-campus, whereas I lived in Brown Hall. I did take a few senior courses in my first year and so we might have been in some classes together.

There were some things in common between us. Neither of us believed that the Westminster Confession or any other Confession for that matter, including the Nicene Creed, could be the basis or content of faith. We both looked for a faith that made it possible for us to care for our fellow-man without anxiety or aggression. But we were moving in two different directions in reaction against a faith that failed to call forth love. He grew towards a rejection of church dogma and even of faith in a personal God. For me the movement was towards a rediscovery of the authentic Christian tradition in which theology played but a supportive role, in which statements about God had to be qualified with the basic assertion of the unknowability of God, and where man's growth into the fullness of

An alumnus of Princeton Seminary (Class of 1954), the Reverend Fr. Vergheese is currently Associate General Secretary of the World Council of Churches and Bishop-Elect of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Malabar. Fr. Vergheese was Preacher-in-Residence to the Seminary campus during the week of April 20-24 and delivered the 1970 James J. Reeb Memorial Lecture.

God's image in freedom, love, wisdom and power was the central concern.

We were both scandalized by the plight of the black man in this country. For Reeb his direct involvement was to come later. For me, I had already worked for three years as a Negro pastor, had known the frustrations and aspirations of the poorer Negroes as well as the callous indifference of the richer ones. I had been kicked out of buses in Atlanta, Georgia, and out of restaurants and hotels in the north. In the summer of 1960, I was with the leaders of the sit-in movement in Nashville, Tennessee. James Reeb became involved in the civil rights movement much later, but when he did so, it was with an abandon and commitment that puts me to shame.

I have never had to face Alabama state troopers on Route 80. The worst I had to face was half a bus-load of pale-face men and women who glared and shouted rude words at me. I have never been viciously hit on my head with a stick. The worst I have experienced is a white hand pulling me out roughly from my bus seat and shouting at me to go behind.

James Reeb died in a cause that is greater than that of Negro civil rights. He died that men may become free and

live in conscious human dignity. He died in the hope of changing the picture of man's future drawn by George Orwell—"If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face—forever."¹

It is not a picture of the future, friends; it is more a picture of the present, and of the past. There is a boot on the face of man—now. To lift that boot is part of a task to build a tomorrow which is more human. But the harder part of our task for tomorrow is first to help the man on the ground get up and eat, and then to help him recover his face and his dignity. And we must also attend to the man with the boot to help him too to be rid of his guilt, and of his aggression and acquisitive urges.

It is in this context that I want to speak about Herbert Marcuse—the prophet of liberation. Since I shall not refer very much again to James Reeb, let me use this occasion to pay tribute to his memory, to his suffering and death in the cause of a better tomorrow for man. May God grant rest to his soul and reward him with the brightness of the countenance of God on the last day.

I

Professor Herbert Marcuse of San Diego University is both a miracle and a paradox. At seventy he could still be the idol of the younger generation, the spokesman of their deepest aspirations. An intellectual of the classical German type, he can still communicate with ordinary people. His knowledge of the fields of philosophy and psychology, of political science and of sociology can

only be termed, encyclopaedic. He is both ex-Marxist and ex-Freudian, but not by any means in a reactionary sense. He has been called a corrupter of the youth and an agent of the C.I.A. His life has been threatened by John Birchers and he has been heckled by striking Italian students.

But Marcuse is a grand intellectual and the apostle of freedom. His recent work, *An Essay on Liberation*, is a tightly packed argument against contemporary civilization, an argument which he began developing in his *Eros and Civilization* and in his better known *One Dimensional Man*. A short general statement of his position is presented in *La Fin de l'Utopie*, Paris, 1968.

His basic argument can be summarized only at great peril of oversimplification. He agrees with Freud that our civilization is built on the basis of the repression of basic human instincts. Hence the desperately acquisitive and aggressive tendency of our civilization. Aggression in Vietnam, oppression of the black race and economic exploitation of the whole world are but symptoms of a deeper disease which cannot be cured except by changing the repressive basis of social organization.

So far he is simply developing Freud. But here he parts company with the master. Freud would say that no civilization is possible without repression, i.e., subjection of the pleasure principle to the reality principle. Marcuse on the other hand believes that a non-repressive civilization is within the limits of possibility. Of course, the present civilization would have to be demolished before a non-repressive one can take its

¹ Duncan Howlett, *No Greater Love—The James Reeb Story*, Harper & Row, 1966.

place. He believes that work itself can be converted into play, that domination can be abolished, that a morality can be based on gratification rather than renunciation. Only such a civilization will promote non-repressive, non-aggressive human relationships.

According to Marcuse corporate capitalism is the major instrument of our civilization. Through an extensive economic and military machine it not only subjects its population to its own activity of production and consumption; it also builds up a new colonial empire through which it controls and dominates four continents.

Marcuse's *Essay on Liberation* is dedicated to the young militants in America and elsewhere who have dared to challenge the frightening might of capitalist domination in the world; Marcuse wants to give a biological or rather somato-psychological basis to socialism. He argues that it is the consumer economy and the capitalist politics of western civilization which have made man what he is today—insular, one-dimensional, aggressive, acquisitive. Man has to be changed physically and psychologically in order that a new civilization may emerge. Man must develop a new sensibility by which he can touch his neighbor without aggressiveness and guilt. The new sensibility also struggles against violence and exploitation wherever it finds these in society. Man must liberate himself from the tyranny of science and technology in order to live in a more gay and joyous relation to all reality. Logic and therefore science and technology based on it over-emphasizes the male principle of aggressive domination. We need to shift the balance to

the female principle of receptivity, beauty and poesy.

Marcuse wrote his book before the events of May 1968 in Paris. There the revolting students practiced what Marcuse preached. They used words to speak a new language—the language of the heart, the language of poetry—to speak about human reality in human language. Only when the aesthetic controls human creativity can science and technology come into their own as truly liberating forces.

Marcuse welcomes Black Power and the Vietnam revolt as healthy subversive forces which can undermine the present sick civilization.

Marcuse criticizes Marx for insisting that only a particular class can be the agent of social change. The old Marxist model for revolutionary change through the organized effort of the working class to seize power in the course of a mass upheaval may still have some validity for the third world. But these working classes themselves are now under the domination of western corporate capitalism and its neo-imperialism.

Therefore, the more decisive revolution, according to Marcuse, may come from the growing movement of protest which is not based in any particular class or country. The peculiar feature of this new protest is that it is not willing to accept the classical Marxist alternative to capitalism. Collective ownership, collective control and collective planning of the means of production and distribution are all necessary elements in the creation of the new society. But it is not simply a question of abolition of poverty and creation of a just international society. Bureaucratic socialism even where it guarantees economic jus-

tice may be very much dehumanized as in the Soviet Union though not in the same measure as corporate capitalism. Marcuse demands a cessation of the productivity race between the west and the east, in Europe and America. What he demands is a new society and a new man with a new body and a new mind. He demands a utopia where work becomes play, the ugly is transformed into the beautiful, noise and hurry give place to calm and poise, fun is substituted by joy and servitude by freedom.

One could say there are three key words in Marcuse's thinking—Rupture, Transcendence and Play. The new man and the new society cannot come in natural continuity with the present civilization in its capitalist-socialist form. It involves a radical break with the present. That is what he means by rupture. By transcendence, he means that man must enter that which is beyond history by a radical transformation of the self. It is a qualitative jump closely related to the idea of rupture. Man must dare to enter utopia. But this is not the utopia envisioned by socialists—that is why he calls his French work *The End of Utopia*. Yet man must dare to create a new world, in freedom and spontaneity, where there is neither aggression nor acquisitiveness. Thought itself would be changed in Marcuse's new utopia into something necessarily positive, de-politicized, free, unstructured, spontaneous. And here comes his third concept. The ultimately characteristic act of man is play, not work. The total automation of social labor is incompatible with capitalism which insists on the creation of more and more goods to satisfy more and more false needs of man. It is also contrary to

Marxism which believes that labor is the creator of all value. We are afraid to make total automation the goal of our society, because we are unwilling to make the qualitative jump from work to play as the basic activity of man.

II

It is perhaps symptomatic of the state of intellectual life in America that there has been no adequate response to him from American intellectuals, but in his own native Germany he has been taken quite seriously. Last year Juergen Habermas edited a collection of essays in honor of his 70th birthday: *Antworten auf Herbert Marcuse*.² Habermas is a thinker of the school of Frankfurt (Institute for Social Research) which produced thinkers like Marcuse. Habermas attacks Marcuse from a more classical socialist position. His study of bourgeois society (*Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*) and his critical analysis of post-Kantian philosophy (*Erkenntnis und Interesse*) as well as his restatement of classical socialism (*Theorie und Praxis*) have been regarded by some reviewers as the most substantial socio-philosophical thinking to come out of central Europe.³ Habermas accuses Marcuse of being an ontologist of the Heideggerian school. Habermas speaks of the old rational heritage being disintegrated through the dialectical interplay of such standpoints as positivism, pragmatism and historicism. These schools have virtually cancelled each other out. Only dialectical mate-

² Suhrkamp Verlag, 1968.

³ See leading article in *The Times Literary Supplement*, June 5, 1969, under the title "From Historicism to Marxist Humanism."

rialism stands as a still valid philosophical approach. Yet another attempt at criticism of Marcuse's ideas have come from Hans Heinz Holz (*Utopie und Anarchismus*, Pahl-Rugenstein Verlag, Köln, 1968). His accusation is also that Marcuse regresses into a romantic-cultural and apolitical interpretation of the revolution.

Both Habermas and Marcuse insist that the present structures are corrupt, especially in the West. But Habermas and Holz would say that Marxism dynamically reinterpreted is adequate as the structure for building up the new society. Habermas would, of course, want such socialism to be undergirded by a systematic philosophy in the classical tradition. Marcuse, on the other hand, would not want to formulate clearly the structure of the new society. He would concentrate on two factors mainly: first, liberation from the colonial and oppressive imperialism of corporate capitalism; second, changed attitudes in the relation of human beings to each other and in their approach to work. Everything else can be worked out only after the qualitative change in man has already taken place. In his negative critique of the Establishment, he speaks also for the New Left. But New Leftists find him unsatisfactory and inadequate in his positive formulations of a new society. Marcuse, however, speaks also for the hippie generation when he talks about liberation from the repression of the pleasure principle by the reality principle, and demands that work be substituted by play, repression by expression.

My own critique of Marcuse would be from a basically phenomenological perspective. Marcuse's understanding of

liberation as freedom is itself based on a defective understanding of the notion of freedom. We in ex-colonial countries have only begun to learn that liberation is the easier part of freedom. We had thrown off the political aspect of the colonial yoke and are only now finding out that we are still unfree. We continue to be under the domination of a world-economic structure controlled by western corporate capitalism which uses our capitalists to exploit us. But even if we were to be liberated from this economic domination by the west, we would still not be quite free until we have achieved sufficient power to realize our own freely chosen goals. Such power should include not only scientific and technological competence, but also cultural autonomy and creativity. This positive aspect of freedom, namely the capacity to choose one's own national goals and to achieve them, is the more difficult part of attaining freedom.

Here Marcuse and the New Left, especially the revolutionists among the latter, refuse to give even a sketch of the kind of society they would like to achieve. They insist that such formulation would be a betrayal of the revolution in that it would lead to unnecessary controversies which would impede the more urgent task of overthrowing the Establishment.

III

While it may be practically impossible to sketch out in detail the original for a complete blue print of the society of the future, it may still be necessary to chalk out in sketchy outlines some of the essential elements which simply have to go into the new structure. Here we come across a very popular fallacy

which opposes freedom to structure. This false opposition I submit comes from a double misunderstanding of freedom. First there is the tendency to put more weight on *freedom from* than on *freedom for*. The second aspect of the fallacy derives from the basically individualistic framework in which we understand freedom. I think Marcuse himself falls into both these traps.

Freedom, a key concept in Eastern Christian theology, is a word which has a large number of synonyms in Greek. The word *eleutheria* itself means "not enslaved." But its synonyms in Eastern Patristic thinking include (a) *apatheia* or freedom from compulsive passions which overcome and enslave our will, (b) freedom from death and corruption, (c) freedom of the intelligence or the capacity to behold Truth (*theoria*), (d) freedom from guilt or a clear conscience (*parrhesia*). There are four other adjectives which are synonymous with *eleutheros* which are *adoulotés* which means unenslaved, *adespotés* or not having a master, *autokrátēs* or sovereign and *autexousios* i.e. having authority in oneself. To be free thus for the Eastern Christian is much more than being liberated. It means becoming spontaneously creative, i.e. to be the originator of the good and the beautiful without being constrained externally or internally to do so. This notion of freedom which has at its heart the image of man as a corporate king over the whole cosmos is a far cry from the notion of man popularized by Augustinian thought in the west. Augustine's image of man sees him as a sinner, broken, repentant, miserable, begging for pardon and mercy, with nothing good in himself, totally dependent on

God alone for grace and mercy. The only freedom that Augustine could grant even to the saved man was simply freedom in the bosom of God like a little baby secure in its mother's arms.

In Eastern Christian thought, at least in classical patristics, there is a demand imposed upon man by his very creation, to become like God—sovereign, free, creator of the good, loving and wise, strong and powerful. It is this more positive notion of freedom as self-control, authority and the capacity for spontaneous creativity that needs greater emphasis in our time. In this positive understanding of freedom, science and technology brave their own important roles to play as the means by which man gains control of external reality.

The second fallacy is so universal that even the Christian church in the East has fallen a prey to it. If freedom means spontaneous creativity, then such creativity need not always be that of individuals in isolation. Structure is one of the ways in which men relate to each other to co-ordinate creativity for greater efforts to create the good, in forms which are beyond the power of individual men to create. We need to learn to think not merely in terms of freedom of the individual from structures, but having free structures under the control of corporate society, which society can freely use to create new forms of good, without being overpowered by the structures themselves.

It has been traditional to see the freedom of the individual as being in conflict with the freedom of other individuals, and the state as being necessary to make sure that one man's freedom does not interfere with that of another man. I am free to swing my hand in any

direction I like; but my neighbor's freedom demands that my swinging hand does not end up on his face. Thus individual freedom is regarded as the primary reality, and the state being necessary only to guarantee the maximum of individual freedom for each man.

But today we are beginning to see the state itself as an instrument of corporate freedom. Freedom means not simply freedom from oppression, exploitation and enslavement, but also the capacity to stand up in dignity and to be the free creator of the good. This is true both for individuals and for societies. Societies themselves have to be redeemed from whatever is holding them enslaved, from the might of military machines and from the crushing cruelty and cupidity of corporate capitalism, as well as from ideologies and apprehensions that prevent men from being spontaneously creative. But it also means the capacity of societies to create new forms of the good. Structures are the means by which large aggregates of human beings relate to each other on a long-term basis. The purpose of these structures should be to achieve maximum possibility of spontaneous creativity for the society as a whole, as well as for its individual members. But these very structures, unless constantly watched, become powerful and domineering, and the pressure of radical evil in the world transforms these very structures into instruments of oppression and unfreedom. It then becomes necessary that the struggle for the liberation of man go through two phases—one, the breaking down of the oppressive, alienated, run-away structure, and two, the building of new creative structures fostering human freedom both

collectively and individually. The first of these operations is called revolution and the second utopia.

IV

But revolution and utopia are two phases of one process rather than two separate stages in a program. It is the vision of utopia that must be the motor of revolution. But here there are two problems.

First, if utopia means merely a list of demands to be presented to those in power, they can always effect a compromise, mute the revolution, and then go on to new forms of oppression and exploitation. This is what is basically wrong with syndicalism or trade unionism.

Secondly, the two phases of the operation seem to be based on conflicting principles. Revolution demands the use of force against the will of those in power in order to unseat them. In other words denial of the freedom of the Establishment to go on being in power belongs to the essence of revolution, whereas in utopia, the guiding principle is the freedom of all persons and of society as a whole. Thus in the interests of utopia, which means the freedom of all, the masses have to be organized to deny freedom to the Establishment and to overthrow it by force—which is contrary to the very idea of freedom.

Utopia is based on love, revolution is based on hatred, even if that hatred is motivated by love for the oppressed. The Old Testament enjoins both of these on man—to love the good and to hate the evil. That is why the Psalmist can say about evildoers with a sense of achievement: "I hate them with a perfect hatred" (Ps. 139:22). They knew

that God loves the righteous and hates the wicked.

But in the New Testament there is a new mood: "Repay no man evil for evil. . . . Avenge not yourselves, but leave it to the wrath of God. . . . Be subject to the authorities for all authority is from God. He who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed. . . . Love your enemies. Be good to the just and the unjust" (Romans 12, 13 and Matt. 5).

The question before man is this. Utopia is the kingdom of God. In order to usher in the kingdom of God are we justified in using methods which are contrary to that kingdom? Can we liberate by unliberal methods?

Here a simple Biblicism cannot provide us with the answers. There are a whole host of points to be taken into account.

(a) In the Bible itself there is the example of Christ overthrowing the bankers' counters—that was a very violent and revolutionary act against an evil establishment.

(b) There is the fact that the liberal approach to liberation often ends up in the establishment of a very oppressive and conservative group in power with the liberals salving the conscience of the nation with a little bit of ineffective critical writing and demonstration.

(c) There is the powerful argument that there is violence deeply entrenched in society, destroying the dignity of man and by refusing to overthrow this violence by forceful and revolutionary means, the liberals are unwittingly supporting the violence that is endemic in society. The accusation is that the liberals are alienated from the exploited masses and are themselves the benefi-

ciaries of the exploitation system which they so loudly denounce, but which they are unwilling to overthrow.

All these three arguments, which one could develop further, provide justification for the revolutionary stance and commitment. But there is another aspect to the problem, about which East European Marxists are becoming more and more exercised. This problem may be briefly stated as the nemesis of hatred. Hatred is not something which we can summon and dismiss at will. Once you begin to hate the evil establishment and steel yourselves to use violent and cruel methods of unseating those in power, you develop habits and attitudes in which you may use the same methods against all your opponents when *you* are in power even in utopia. In other words the revolutionary methods used for the first phase of liberation have an inescapable and significant impact on the nature of utopia itself. Eastern European Communist leaders are complaining that Marxism-Leninism does not provide them with the basis for dealing with the nemesis of hatred and the fact of guilt which leads to alienation even among revolutionary leaders.

Any theology of revolution that does not take fully into account these two related problems of the nemesis of hatred and the inevitability of guilt will be basically defective. But neither of these two problems should be used as adequate reasons for ruling out revolution as part of the means for the liberation of man. What we need further honest discussion on seems to me to be the nature of the dialectic between revolution and utopia in the struggle for liberation.

V

I must conclude with a summing up of some of the issues raised by Marcuse and his critics in relation to revolution and liberation.

First, to me Marcuse himself seems alienated from the stark realities of poverty, exploitation and the mass murder of human dignity that is going on in our contemporary societies. While attacking the bourgeois ideology and mentality, he himself writes as one who lives in bourgeois comfort in a comfortable academic world. In thinking about a new humanity, he seems to say that this is something to be created in an advanced technological society even while two-thirds of the world is living in abject poverty. Is this possible or desirable? Can we create a non-repressive civilization in one part of the world, without waiting for the economic emancipation and cultural (including scientific-technological) growth of the rest of the world? The Black Panther movement in America started out as a national movement. But at least the Black Panthers have realized that this is no longer possible. In a new statement written by the national office of the Black Panther party (*Guardian/Panthers*, February 1970, page 1) we find the following affirmation:

"The Black Panther party stands for revolutionary solidarity with all people fighting against the forces of imperialism, capitalism, racism and fascism. Our solidarity is extended to those people who are fighting these evils at home and abroad. Because we understand that our struggle for our liberation is part of a world-wide

struggle being waged by the poor and the oppressed against imperialism and the world's chief capitalist, the United States of America, we—the Black Panther party—understand that the most effective way that we can aid our Vietnamese brothers and sisters is to destroy imperialism from the inside, attack it where it breeds."

Thus the Black Panther party breathes the air of genuine proletarian internationalism while Marcuse speaks from a post-affluent society. Marcuse holds but little attraction for those who feel part of an international struggle for justice and peace in the world. The basic criticism of Marcuse levelled by his colleagues in Germany, that he remains outside the political struggle and seeks a cultural-romantic revolution without an economic and political revolution for the liberation of man, seems thus justified.

The second critique of Marcuse is closely related to the first and has also been raised by Habermas and Holz. Marcuse takes man as an ontological object—a *dasein* in the world, rather than as a historical and social reality. He is too individualistic and existentialist in his basic orientation even when speaking about man's relation to his fellowmen. He does not give enough attention to the problems of structures, in their historical and dialectical perspective. Nor does he show how the famous qualitative jump from here to utopia is to be achieved. There can be no genuine liberation of man without his being able to control the structures that regulate his life as a corporate entity. Here the interesting debate in France between the structuralists under

the leadership of Claude Lévi-Strauss and the Existentialists with Jean-Paul Sartre at their head is of eminent interest to all concerned with the liberation of man. Lévi-Strauss, like his counterpart Noam Chomski in this country, thinks that fundamental structures for language, or for human social organization are given, and of but limited variation. It is possible, the structuralists claim, to study scientifically, with absolute objectivity, the limited number of alternative structures open to any given human society at a given historical point in its development. It is up to that society to make the decision, again with scientific objectivity, to choose the particular structure that offers the maximum advantage, and then to build that structure.

While the existentialists say, with Kierkegaard, "Truth is subjectivity," the structuralists say "Truth is objectivity." By a study of the patterns of culture developed in the past by human society, it is possible to work out a strict science of structures. By sheer objective measurement and computation we are able to choose the right kind of structures. This ambitious claim of French ethnologists and anthropologists does not seem to be receiving much attention in the Anglo-Saxon world. Jean Piaget has recently published an introduction to Structuralism, and a more objective introduction by Yvan Simonis was published in 1968, under the title *Claude Lévi-Strauss ou la "Passion de l'inceste."* I have a feeling that this Structuralism also belongs to the malaise of western civilization which is morally tired. Can we hand over all our moral choices to a computer? Can we build that perfect technological

society where all evil and the possibility of evil has been banished? Have we yet resolved the Russian debate of the middle of the last century between two contemporaries of Kierkegaard—Dostoevsky and Chernishevsky? The latter feels that science and technology can build the perfect structure and the perfect society (Chernishevsky, *What Is To Be Done?*) while Dostoevsky in his *Notes from the Underground* speaks about the man with the dour face who would want to assert his basic freedom by smashing the perfect structure which takes away his freedom to be evil.

I wish I had time to develop that question still further. But I want to go beyond Marcuse and Habermas to say man is both a structure-creating and structure-inhabiting animal, and also a person who is capable of standing alone in dignity, defying all structures and all external constraints. Man is both a *dasein-in-the-world à la Heidegger*, and a social being *à la* Marxism. Marcuse and the Marxists must get together to give us a more inclusive program of liberation.

A final point by way of conclusion. Most of us live in a measure of bourgeois comfort, and the call of freedom disconcerts us. For freedom's call questions our love of security, comfort and ease. And can Christians afford to be secure, comfortable and at ease in a society which is basically unjust, exploitative, oppressive, violent, cruel, destructive of the dignity of man? Are we not put to shame by the fact that the call for liberation has always to come from outside the church, and has to be basically anti-church? The French revolution, the first genuine outburst of

freedom, the church opposed and later came to terms with in the Second Vatican Council. The Bolshevik Revolution, an outburst of freedom, however distorted and unfree it may have since become, also evoked a negative response from the church because its bourgeois love of comfort was threatened. And now there are the revolutions of the Blacks and the students. Are we still going to be threatened by these, or can we see in them the call to freedom coming from Christ and the Holy Spirit?

It is significant that Eldridge Cleaver was a dope peddler and a rapist. Why did an oppressed and hounded man have to go to the depths of evil in order to find his freedom? I would say because in the churches which claimed

the monopoly of freedom and goodness there was no room for a man who genuinely sought freedom and the good. I regard the Black Power movement as the most significant harbinger of the liberation for which James Reeb and Martin Luther King longed and suffered and died. If it has to be led by men with hatred as their power, with the willingness to shoot and kill as their shock technique, that is only an indictment of our society, not of the movement. So long as we Christians continue to love our comfort and our ease, rather than heed the call for the liberation of man, we shall remain unfaithful to the One who came to set us free.

The boot of the oppressor is still in the face of man. Shall it go on forever?

Faith to Follow

Sermon delivered in Miller Chapel, April 8, 1970. Dr. McLeod is minister-elect of Bloor Street Church, Toronto, Canada. An alumnus of Emmanuel College, Toronto, he holds the Th.D. degree in Homiletics from Union Theological Seminary, New York.

by N. BRUCE McLEOD

"Passing along by the Sea of Galilee, Jesus saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon, casting a net in the sea; for they were fishermen. And Jesus said to them, 'Follow me. . . .' And immediately they left their nets and followed him. And going on a little farther, he saw James the son of Zebedee and John his brother, who were in their boat mending the nets. And immediately he called them; and they left their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired servants, and followed him. . . . And as he passed on, he saw Levi the son of Alphaeus sitting at the tax office, and he said to him, 'Follow me.' And he rose and followed him. . . . Simon Peter said to him, 'Lord where are you going?' Jesus answered, 'Where I am going you cannot follow me now; but you shall follow afterward.' Peter said to him, 'Lord, why cannot I follow you now? I will lay down my life for you.' Jesus answered, 'Will you lay down your life for me? Truly, truly, I say to you, the cock will not crow, till you have denied me three times. Let not your hearts be troubled. . . . You know the way where I am going.' Thomas said to him, 'Lord, we do not know where you are going; how can we know the way?' Jesus said to him, 'I am the way, and the truth and the life. . . .' And they were on the road, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was walking ahead of them; and they were amazed, and those who followed were afraid."

(Mark 1:16-20; 2:14; John 13:36-14:1, 4-6; Mark 10:32)

SPRING of the year finds most of us in the Church caught, more noticeably than usual, on that narrow standing place between what has gone before and the unknown looming ahead. Men across the land, completing another year, are wondering if it is for them an end or a beginning, whether the Church is still a fit instrument for God's hand or has become too blunt for his continued use. Some of you here, no doubt with somewhat the same mix of feelings, are looking forward to ordination—wondering if it is really right for you, if it is really worth facing those examining committees which will in weeks ahead be asking all kinds of questions,

including, in the United Church of Canada, whether the ordinand is in "essential agreement" with a Statement of Faith which was written down in 1925.

And some among us are weary with it all. Some doubt whether much more that is useful can be done through them. Some, by contrast, are full of plans and confidence for days ahead. Some are full of certainty, like Peter. Some are not so sure. All of us, to some degree, are both apprehensive and expectant on the edge of what is coming at this end of the 20th century.

In this situation, I want to think with you today about the shape and priority

of our commitment, about what the relationship and the difference is within it between our initiative and God's, between affirming some intention of ours, repeating some creedal formulation, and being caught by some other intention, and responding to the Spirit that enlivens this community, and the whole Church of which it is a part, and drives or drags it on into the future in the name of Jesus Christ.

"They were on the road, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was walking ahead of them; and they were amazed, and those who followed were afraid."

I

The first thing that cries to be said is that Christian faith requires not belief before commitment, but commitment before belief.

The Church has never grown by grabbing people's lapels, regaling them with arguments for the existence of God, the occurrence of certain miracles, or the emptiness of Jesus' tomb, until they agree to believe in these things, and then saying, "All right, you're in!" Historically, the point at which people have become Christians has not been the point at which they were able to swallow all this without regurgitation, or essential disagreement. In fact, it is quite possible to believe all these things and more, not essentially but literally, and not be a Christian this April morning at all.

Christian faith, for all its historical roots, is not primarily concerned with getting people to agree that certain things took place 2,000 years ago. Rather it is motivation for a style of living, a way of walking, today and years ahead as far as we can see. Christian faith has

nothing to do with winning agreement that a fish once swallowed a man, or that Jesus once stilled a storm or was seen walking around some days after his death. It has to do, rather, with the surprising mercy of God, which indeed the old book of Jonah was talking about, but which wraps us round today as well. It has to do with a power still to be found in the community which wears the name of Christ, a power which still today in all our churches, freed men from fear of death, and enables them to face the storms that break on any day's front page with confidence and hope. There have been two funerals in our congregation in the last two days. It was fitting that in between, on Monday night, children laughed and ran. For though the yellow face of cancer took its toll, it did not triumph in those families. Affirmation, trust, and hope came through for all to see.

The point where the church has grown has just not been when men, gazing backwards, have said, "Oh yes, I believe it." It has been, rather, as they saw on their streets, in their present midst, a community of people not afraid of, or hampered by, the same things as other men, giving themselves, singly and together, for the world's fuller life, free to love and laugh, to live with joy and compassion, no matter what failures in the past, hurt in the present, or uncertainty ahead. A peculiar people, not focused on the past at all, but on the day at hand, finding joy in it, and purpose, that others watching cannot always see.

In Rome, the community seemed to be driven, directed, motivated by some commanding Spirit so present, so contemporary, that the emperor's secret

police actually believed there was a leader called Christ living there; and orders exist which call for his arrest. People were attracted to the community not by what the Christians said they believed about events in Palestine but by the lives they lived in Rome. They saw the lives before they heard about the beliefs; and they were drawn as by a magnet to the way the Christians walked, and walked with them before they even talked about belief. Not belief before commitment, but commitment before belief.

Mark, who lived in Rome, is making just this point as he tells in his out-of-breath, present tense style how Jesus passes along, not stopping, by the lakeside and sees two fishermen. "Follow me," comes the word, immediately they leave their nets and follow. Going on a little farther he sees two more in boats mending their nets and immediately (again Mark's much used word), he calls them, and leaving their work and their father they follow. Later, as he passes, he sees Levi at his desk. "Follow" he says to him and he rose and followed him.

Of course it is likely that, in the historical situation, Jesus knew these men before and had had some prior conversation with them. But Mark, telling it this way, is declaring to men in Rome who knew it still happened like that, that here is a man who passing along, not even slowing his pace, draws men after him by the power of his presence. No cajoling or persuading, no stopping to win their belief, just the force of his passing, and they found themselves drawn after.

It wasn't that their beliefs were settled and their doubts left far behind,

they hadn't sat down and shuffled doctrines, and said, "oh yes, that's true," before they went. If asked to explain their action to an examining committee, they might have found it hard. Their father likely never understood. They hardly understood themselves. They didn't even know where he was going.

They were dragged, Mark is saying, by a compulsion beyond themselves. He drew them on past all belief. Nor did he stop to explain, to curl up small before them so they could understand. He just said "Follow," and "they were on the road, and Jesus was walking ahead and those who followed were afraid."

II

Commitment before belief. Belief was not the thing that made them follow. Belief, such as it was, developed on the way. Formal reason or justification for their decision could not have been developed before they made their move. Validation of their following could not have been found by remaining in the boat and analyzing the situation. For one thing, the presence of Jesus would have been gone. They would only find out who he was, and be able to express it in terms of belief, as they followed in his way.

Still it happens the same way. Albert Schweitzer said in the final paragraph of his famous book about Jesus, "He comes to us as of old, by the lakeside, he came to those men who knew him not. He speaks to us the same words, 'Follow thou me,' and sets us to the tasks which he has to fulfill for our time. He commands, and, to those who obey him, he will reveal himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which

they shall pass through in his fellowship. And, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience who he is."

Always this is the emphasis of Biblical faith, which here is in sharpest contrast to other ancient religions, which commonly set up shrines to commemorate holy times and places. Biblical faith is a call not to belief in certain things that happened just so once upon a time, but a call to walk on a path whose validation will emerge only on the way ahead. And beliefs take their place not as material to be swallowed before the way is taken, but as along-the-way expressions of the experience of those who walk. Not to be used to convince others who are not yet walking—they could hardly understand—but to share with other walkers, to ponder together with them on the wonder of the way.

The words the walkers use, the beliefs they frame and leave behind them on the way in creeds and statements will have a certain consistency, since they are all responding to the same power which has passed down many years. But the phrases, images, and thought forms that are naturally used, say, in the 4th century, when no one knew the world was round or the earth moved round the sun, will not always, or often, prove helpful expressions for those who walk the way in 1970, or 1987 which is where you'll be when you have been ordained as long as I. Nor will the best expressions of 1925 or any year ever be more than tentative approximations.

The reality that drags us on the way is beyond the net of any phrase, and will not be caught and caged in formulas or words of any kind from us whose

standing place is so limited, whose point of purchase on the mystery is so small, and who had better be ready sometimes to let go of what little corner of God's reality we think we know in order to get a better grasp of who he really is.

III

Belief then not only does not precede commitment, the form it finds on the way is tentative at best. And the third thing to note is this: less important than our belief in God is his in us. Less significant than Peter's faith in Jesus was Jesus' faith in him. The anchor in that relationship was not in Peter but in the Lord who believed in him, had work for him to do, and would not let him go.

Less important than our drawing our intellects up to their full height and announcing that we believe in God, as though without our intellectual assent he could not live and work, is his belief in us. This is symbolized in infant baptism, where sometimes wailing infants, plainly with no power of belief, are nonetheless made members of the church as God declares, whether or not they ever confirm it on their own, that he believes in them, in the significance of their lives for his purpose in the world. It is also symbolized in the service of ordination, which some of us look back on and others here have yet ahead. In that service, less important than our commitment to God is our response to a commitment that belongs to him, is made by him, and reaches through our fragile words to all within our reach.

Not our faith in him, but his in us is what is strong. My faith alone is not that reliable. It tends to waver, vary, with how I feel, with what I face and

where I stand. Yet what persists, no matter if my faith's temperature is up or down, is the sense of some expectation laid upon my life, the sense of being accountable to something that requires the use of me, and that drags me to the way of its service whether I feel like it or not. Something that has faith in me regardless of how my faith is doing.

Gordon Sinclair, a professional Canadian skeptic, declares over and again that he has not been able to believe in God since he went to India and saw the hurt on every street. Perhaps the fact he keeps talking about it shows he's still not sure. Certainly I do not have any easy explanation for the suffering that would satisfy him or me. What I do find is that once seen the suffering, whether in India or at our own back door, no matter how impossible to explain, how shattering to my faith, I cannot like Sinclair easily back away, as though I had no responsibility there.

I find, however slow my words of faith may be, I am impelled to respond to some Presence there. I am drawn to be a part of this community, the Church, which exists in large part to care about the suffering there. Within the Church—strange, down every age—lives appear like that of Dr. Bob McClure, who is the United Church of Canada's present Moderator. He has been for 40 years a doctor in Christ's name across the earth, and plans to return to the Third World when his present term is up. These lives rise up not in entire spontaneity, not just out of the goodness of their hearts, but as though in response to some force abroad which has faith in them however their own words may halt, and which would

use them to cover the awful hurt. Some force abroad today which passes by me sitting in my boat in this fat land mending nets in privacy, and moves on into suffering that racks our world and leaves me not with explanation, but just the sense that I must follow, that I am needed, required.

And it's not my faith in God that moves me, or that matters much. But his in me; his incredible, relentless faith in unreliable me. It's not the sense that I see God. I don't always or often. But the conviction that he sees me and is dragging me, reluctant sometimes, to the place where he must go.

"They were on the road, and Jesus was walking ahead, and those who followed were afraid." Not just did their commitment precede their belief, and the articles of their faith never get beyond tentative form, it was less their faith in him than his in them which dragged them on the way.

IV

Just one more thing to say. Christian faith is just that—faith, not knowledge. Even as we leave everything and follow, we have to face the fact we may be wrong. Simon and Andrew, James and John had no rockribbed assurance they were right, and as they followed they had many a second thought, no doubt encouraged by their parents who must have thought them mad to leave. After Jesus died Peter announced he was going back to fishing.

Nor is there any greater certainty given to us. Christian faith, the decision to follow the way of Christ, is really a decision, before all the facts are in, about what the world is really like, affirmation that beneath the hurt on

every hand there lies a Love that will one day make the world its own. But let's face it, it's a calculated risk. We may be wrong. The smart thing in a world like ours, where 15,000 who woke with us this morning will have starved by night to death, may be to keep our elbows high, our money well invested, our energies devoted to persuading men to eat a different cornflake.

And there are clues that indicate as much. There is black blind pain this moment in our world before which our easy Hallelujahs are affront and shame, events before which even wordy Western Christians must stand speechless, with no word of faith in easy reach. I say the question is open, and we Christians may be wrong.

There are clues that back us up as well, of course. It was out of such blackness, not in ignorance of it, that the Church's faith arose, and sang about a cross. And there are other clues. Not least of which are men like Bob McClure. The Church is full of them. Out across the world this morning there are lively, vigorous, blunt people, teachers, doctors, social workers, agriculturalists, ministers, laying their lives like bandages across the wounds that scar the earth. They are there in the name of Jesus Christ. And they are clues. If they are kooks, sick, victims of an illusion, then we need more kooky, sick victims. When you meet them you don't get the feeling that they have missed the point of life.

One of the great arguments for Christian faith today lies not, to be sure, in the fake Gothic solemnities of North American Sunday mornings, but in the caring, life-giving work the Church is

doing across the world, and here as well, and which finally is hard for skeptics to explain away.

And yet, these are clues alone. Kaj Munk, a Danish minister who was executed by the Nazis for aiding the Jews, wrote before he died, "Yes, perhaps it is all a mistake, this business about Christianity. Sometimes it really looks to me like that. Perhaps all this talk about God and Jesus Christ and the salvation of men is just a collection of fairy tales. And I am a minister. Perhaps this is a mistake too. Perhaps a mistake to preach love and forgiveness in a hate-torn world, to rescue those who are in need, to teach the children, to comfort the lonely and the dying. But if it is, after all, a mistake, then it is a beautiful mistake. If Christianity should turn out, after all, to be true, then unbelief will have been a very ugly mistake."

V

Simon and Andrew, at any rate, left their nets and followed him, and James and John their father, and Levi his cluttered desk. "And they were on the road, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was walking ahead of them; and they were amazed, and those who followed were afraid."

No wonder, for their commitment preceded their belief. Their belief was just expression of their commitment, and never reached the form of evidence. Voices on every side, the very shape of the world around, reminded them that they might be wrong.

But still the figure moved ahead of them, with no explanation of where he was going, or why he wanted them to

come. Just the word "follow" in their ears. What drew them on with strange magnetism was less their belief in him, than his in them.

It drew them down the years, and

draws them still in Christian faith. It passes even through this time and place and calls us all from God's future to stand up, and walk out of what is past, with faith to follow on the way.

The Pulpit

Lord, I am afraid of my pulpit.
I am afraid it is irrelevant.
I am afraid of the demands it makes upon
my time and energy.

And yet it stands there in the Church.
It stands to tell me I must speak.
It stands to speak as once it spoke to me.
So I must mount its steps again.

But what shall I say?
And how shall I say it?
And who will listen?
And who will benefit?

Speaking is a serious business.
Speaking tells the man you are.
Speaking makes the Church that is.
And speaking can betray.

Lord, I am afraid of my pulpit.
Thy pulpit,
The Church's pulpit.

I am afraid that the things the Church is saying by
its clumsy, awkward, slow administration counteract
the message of its Christ.

And is it Christlike?
Is it humble?

How often does it stoop to wash another's feet?

Lord, I am afraid of my pulpit.
Because I am a member of the Church.
Because I am a sinner with the Church.
And I partake of all her faults.

And yet I have to preach.
I have to preach before the Sacrament.
I have to preach where men can answer back.
in groups, discussion and in dialogue.

Lord, I am afraid of my pulpit.
Give me grace to see its relevance.
Give me grace to trust its future.
Give me words to speak Thy grace.
Thy grace which called
Thy grace which equipped
Thy grace which I encountered
through the words our Savior uttered;
Probing words,
Cleaning words,
Healing words.
The words of the Word made flesh, spoken
from the pulpit of his body.
Jesus Christ our Lord.

(Reprinted from *Preaching Today*, by D. W. Cleverley Ford,
Epworth Press, 1969, pp. ii & iii. Used by permission.)

It Happens Only Once

by S T KIMBROUGH, JR.

(Sermon based on Thornton Wilder's *Our Town*)

S T Kimbrough, Jr. is an assistant professor of Old Testament Literature at Princeton Theological Seminary. A native of Birmingham, Alabama, Dr. Kimbrough is a graduate of Duke University Divinity School and received the Th.D. degree from Princeton in 1966.

MOST of us reflect at times on the value of our lives, and Thornton Wilder presses us to such introspection in his play, *Our Town*. It has a message for us because it portrays life in a small community, Grover's Corners, where people have missed to a great extent the whole purpose of living. We face the inevitable enigma that we should appreciate life, and yet, it is never actually real to us. This is because, like the people in this play, we do not want to be disturbed. We want a happy ending to everything.

In *Our Town* the people lived as though they never expected their earthly lives to end. They seemed almost oblivious to the fact that—it happens only once—earthly life, I mean. In Wilder's preface to the play, he lays this reality before the reader, "Every action which has ever taken place—every thought, every emotion—has taken place only once, at one moment in time and place. 'I love you,' 'I rejoice,' 'I suffer,' have been said and felt many billions of times, and never twice the same. Every person who has ever lived has lived an unbroken succession of unique occasions." The startling truth is that we need to know the simple facts about ourselves.

The message of *Our Town* weighs heavily on our consciences, because it

involves people like us who never come to know what life is about. There are actually no main characters; indeed if there were, the purpose of the play would be defeated. In summary, the purpose is, in Wilder's words, "an attempt to find a value above all price for the smallest events in our daily life." Therefore, every character has a vital role. Continuity is given to the play by the Stage Manager who interprets the life of the people in Grover's Corners. Dr. Gibbs, the local physician, is a tolerant, trusting, provincial, and warm individual. Mrs. Gibbs is a faithful mother who sometimes wants to break out of the routine of Grover's Corners. Dr. and Mrs. Gibbs have a son named George and a daughter, Rebecca. The Webbs live next door to the Gibbs and are friendly, genuine, kind-hearted neighbors. They too have a son and daughter, Wally and Emily. The play centers around the life of George Gibbs and Emily Webb who grow up together, fall in love, get married, and live as husband and wife for nine years. Then Emily dies during the birth of her second child, leaving George to care for a four-year-old son and an infant.

Act I deals with the daily life of the people in Grover's Corners; Act II—the marrying of Emily and George. Act

III tells of Emily's death and how she wanted to come back to life to relive it. The traumatic experience of reliving just one day, however, sent her hurriedly back to her place among the dead, for she saw how blind living people really were.

Go with me in imagination to *Our Town*, a village beyond time and space, where we may consider what happens in the lives of ordinary human beings—their growing up, their marrying, their living, and their dying. Do not forget that *Our Town* is our town.

I

There can be no life without growth. Life must have its beginning. Growing up is a result of a beginning. The process is sometimes reduced to no more than a Darwinian "survival of the fittest," but such an attitude can cause one to miss the joy of being young. Growing up can be a cruel process, for one changes whether he likes it or not. Most of us don't really want to grow up, and yet, there's the child's constant aspiration to be an adult. When he reaches adulthood, he longs to be a child again. When George was about to be married, he reflected this frustration when he pleaded with his mother, "Ma, I don't want to grow old." Part of growing up is learning the way of nature—physical life has a beginning and an ending. The chestnut curls turn to braids of silver and the dark brown hair turns to temples of gray.

One of the most important parts of growing up concerns our response to people. It is often the fault of the young to take their friends and families for granted. This was probably George's greatest fault. He didn't show apprecia-

tion to his mother and father for the simple things they did for him, which, in the final analysis, were the most significant. Listen to a conversation between George and his father:

Dr. Gibbs: "George, how old are you?"

George: "I? I'm sixteen, almost seventeen."

Dr. Gibbs: "What do you want to do after school's over?"

George: "Why, you know, Pa. I want to be a farmer on Uncle Luke's farm."

Dr. Gibbs: "You'll be willing, will you, to get up early and milk and feed the stock . . . and you'll be able to hoe and hay all day?"

George: "Sure, I will. What are you . . . what do you mean, Pa?"

Dr. Gibbs: "Well, George, while I was in my office today I heard a funny sound . . . and what do you think it was? It was your mother chopping wood. There you see your mother—getting up early; cooking meals all day long; washing and ironing;—and still she has to go out in the back yard and chop wood. I suppose she just got tired of asking you. She just gave up and decided it was easier to do it herself. And you eat her meals, and put on the clothes she keeps nice for you, and you run off and play baseball,—like she's some hired girl we keep

around the house but that we don't like very much. Well, I knew all I had to do was call your attention to it."

It is clear that George could get lost in the dreams of his future, but he couldn't fulfill his present obligations responsibly. George is like a million other boys who have to be reminded again and again of their duties. Unfortunately sometimes these youngsters reach death never having truly appreciated the home-cooked meals and a freshly pressed shirt from the work of a mother's hand. Growing up always involves awareness of one's responsibility and a willingness to take it to task.

Growing up also involves relationships with our brothers, sisters, and friends. What do children think about as they grow up? The boys at first despise the girls, but later they love them! The girls think how horrible it is to like spiders, lizards, and frogs, but later they'll even hold one of these to win the trust of a boy-friend. Sometimes brothers and sisters are farthest apart at the times they ought to be closest together. One night George was wistfully gazing out of his bedroom window, when suddenly his sister, Rebecca, appeared and tried to move in beside him. Quickly he blurted out, "Get out, Rebecca. There's only room for one at this window. You're always spoiling everything." How wonderful it would have been if he had said, "Come on in, Sis." Strange it is that in our most thoughtful moments we often drive our loved ones from us because we want the immured fellowship of our own souls. It is easy for us to see what

George should have done, or even how we should react, but the fact remains that when such situations arise, we forget that—*it happens only once*.

From the beginning of her relationship with George, Emily was a genuine friend. Helping him with an arithmetic problem was such a little thing, but she did not know that she was helping to mold the man she was going to marry. And if we dare to be imaginative, it probably wasn't until after Emily was dead that George ever remembered the nights his childhood sweetheart had helped him with math. Death scares up a thousand memories that earth covers with its million cares.

Our response to nature is another important facet of growing up. Although Emily realized after her death how much she had missed in her life, she had more than a passing affection for the beauty of nature. One night her father asked her why she wasn't in bed and she replied, "I don't know. I just can't sleep yet, Papa. The moonlight's so wonderful. And the smell of Mrs. Gibbs' heliotrope. Can you smell it?" She's in love? Oh, yes! But it's more than love that makes her senses active—it's God. He has left his footprints in the trees and flowers, sun, moon, and stars.

Growing up! Did you ever think about Jesus as a boy who grew up like other boys? We tend to think about him only as the miracle worker. Did you ever wonder if he had "growing pains" in his legs and feet, or if he stumped his toe? The scriptures tell us he grew. How? In wisdom—his parents taught him the Holy Scriptures and he went to the synagogue for teaching. In stature—he was not born an

adult; he went through nature's processes of physical development. More important, he grew in favor with God and man. In the light of the Christian gospel, all these things are part of growing up.

As persons grow up they must respond responsibly to other individuals and to the world about them. Christianity exhorts all men to grow in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.

II

Even growth itself is not enough to give life meaning. Man's desire for love must be satisfied. In Act II of *Our Town* the Stage Manager quotes a mid-western poet who said, "You've got to love life to have life, and you've got to have life to love life." A meaningful life must be a life of love. Love perpetuates life, for it draws men and women into the bonds of marriage. Soon they become mothers and fathers, then grandmothers and grandfathers, and life goes on.

Choosing one's mate is a tremendously important task, because life comes to each person only once. If someone selects the wrong partner, he is destined for unhappiness. Let us examine the marriage of Emily and George and observe how it harbored lasting qualities for any marriage. Before we do, I call your attention to the advice of the Stage Manager:

"I want you to try to remember what it was like to have been very young. And particularly the days when you were first in love; when you were like a person sleepwalking, and you didn't quite see the street you were in, and didn't quite hear

everything that was said to you. You're just a little bit crazy. Will you remember that please?"

First, their marriage illustrates how every couple must sever, at least in part, the ties of family and friends that have held them fast in years gone by. George's mother was especially reluctant to give him up and she held on as long as she could. In anticipating the marriage she said to Dr. Gibbs:

"I declare, Frank, I don't know how he'll get along. I've arranged his clothes and seen to it he's put warm things on,—Frank! They're too young. Emily won't think of such things. He'll catch his death of cold in a week."

Even on his wedding day she made sure that he put on his overshoes, when he stepped across the yard to the Webbs' house, because it was raining. When she saw that George didn't like the idea, she exclaimed, "From tomorrow on you can kill yourself in all weathers, but while you're in my house you'll live wisely, thank you."

There comes a time when a mother or father must watch their children walk away with partners for life. They should be able to say to themselves, "There go nineteen, twenty, or twenty-one years of my best efforts, now they're on their own." The close ties of parent and child have been broken. This principle is established in the story of Adam and Eve in the second chapter of Genesis, "Therefore shall man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Genesis 2:24, KJV).

No longer will a husband and wife

be as close to their own intimate friends as in the past. At the least the complexion of the relationship will change because someone has taken the place of the friend in a more intimate way. We have to break these ties, but it must happen. When Si Crowell, who delivered the newspapers in Grover's Corners, was asked by a friend one day if there were anything in the paper worth knowing, he replied, "Nothing much, except we're losing about the best baseball pitcher Grover's Corners ever had—George Gibbs." You see, even for baseball playing—it *happens only once*.

Second, George and Emily's marriage was built on more than shallow affection. It had its foundation in understanding love. Each wanted to be loved and each was willing to love. This is not a "Pollyanna" philosophy of marriage which asserts that everything will always turn out all right. No! It will not! But love without understanding is no more than an obsession or infatuation. Let me illustrate this by describing how Emily and George came to realize that they were meant for each other.

It was their junior year in high school. Emily had been avoiding George for some time and he couldn't figure out why. One afternoon after school he offered to carry her books for her. She obliged and in the course of their conversation on the way home, George found out more than he had bargained for. Emily explained to him that he had been spending so much time on baseball that he had gotten conceited and stuck-up. George reacted sensibly, "I . . . I'm glad you said it, Emily. I never thought that such a thing was happening to me. I guess it's hard for a fella

not to have faults creep into his character." In the remainder of their conversation they began to see that neither one had the right to expect the other to be perfect and that they must be understanding of the other's faults. Before they got home George took Emily to the drug store to buy her an ice-cream soda. Then he said to her, "I'm celebrating because I've got a friend who tells me all the things that ought to be told me." Here is one of the tests of meaningful marriage—receiving criticism with understanding love. As a result George purposed to change his personality. Through this experience both came to know that they were meant for each other.

When a person marries he is not simply meeting his own needs, but those of another person also. This is why love must be self-giving. Just before the wedding ceremony Mr. Webb asked George if he thought he could take care of Emily. George declared that he wanted to try. Then in meek sincerity Emily said to George, "Well, if you love me, help me. All I want is someone to love me." The need of every marriage is love.

There is probably no better place that the Christian can turn for advice and strength concerning his married life than to Paul's Letter to the Ephesians.

"Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her. . . . Even so husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself . . . let each one of you love his wife as himself, and let the wife see that she respects her husband" (5:25, 28, 32, RSV).

Even with an appreciation of one's new relationship in marriage and the indispensable need of understanding love, he does not know into what kind of life marriage will lead him. It will depend largely upon what he sees as the supreme values of life.

III

We often fail to see any meaning in our living. There are voluminous reasons.

Some people are just too carefree. Maybe the Stage Manager gave the proper diagnosis of this problem when he said, "Wherever you come near the human race, there's layers and layers of nonsense." Although Dr. Gibbs was somewhat sensitive to the needs of others around him, he was quite nonchalant most of the time. It was certainly no compliment that his wife paid him when she said, "I haven't heard a serious word out of him since I've known him." There is by all means a place for humor in our lives, but every person needs to seriously consider the meaning of his own life. You can't pass off life just as one big joke!

Some people are despondent and smother life's values with their depression and troubles. They'll even take their own lives—commit suicide. Simon Stimson, the town drunk in *Our Town*, did just that. What he got out of living is best seen in the words he spoke after Emily, disillusioned and sad, had returned from earth to her place among the dead. He said to her:

"Now you know! That's what it was to be alive. To move about in a cloud of ignorance; to go up and down trampling on the feelings of

those . . . of those about you. To spend and waste time as though you had a million years. To be always at the mercy of one self-centered passion, or another. Now you know—that's the happy existence you wanted to go back to. Ignorance and blindness."

This is his own distorted, yet somewhat realistic, view of life which is drenched with self-centeredness, one of the greatest causes of despondency. He was living to die, not living to live. If only he had thought in his depressed moments—*it happens only once!*

"To each man is given a day and his work for the day:

And once, and no more, he is given to travel this way."

(Edwin Markham)

Some are trapped in the mystery of disaster. Emily and George had made such a fine beginning. They were blessed with the birth of a son. For the nine years of their married life, George worked hard on his farm to make it productive. Then it happened—Emily died while giving birth to their second child. But life must go on! Emily's earthly life will not go on. Some of us may be trapped by the mystery of disastrous and untimely death, never having come to realize the value in the simple things of life.

Some just live out the routine of life. So many individuals are caught in a vice—they hate to live and they dread to die—"tired of livin' and scared of dyin'." So, they only bide their time. What we need is an appreciation for the routine, simple, dull tasks of life. Coupled with this should be an ability

to get outside oneself and see the rest of the world in motion. How refreshing it is to hear Mrs. Gibbs say, "it seems to me that once in your life before you die you ought to see a country where they don't talk English and don't even want to."

Man needs a life that is so great that that it cannot be defeated by time. God promised such a life through his only Son who said, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (John 10:10, KJV). It is to be abundant both now and forever. The carefree, the distressed, those trapped by disaster, and those paralyzed by routine will find in Christ the secret of a meaningful life, for he discloses God's love in the plain and simple things of life. Remember how he said,

"Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And yet I say unto you. That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" (Matt. 6:28-30).

No matter what we make out of life, we share at least one thing in common—mortality.

Death is often looked upon as punishment, but it is actually liberation and release from the cares of this world. In *Our Town* dying is somewhat uniquely observed, for Emily is permitted to look back upon what happened on at least one day in her life. One cannot read the last act of this play without vividly getting its point. In summary it is this:

death closes the door to our intentions—what we should have done or how we should have lived. When death comes our earthly dreams vanish!

It is an illuminating experience to go back with Emily to earth for her one day, her twelfth birthday. Listen to her talking to the others among the dead before she makes the journey. The scene is the graveyard where she and other of the townsfolk are buried. She speaks to her mother-in-law, Mrs. Gibbs, who has been dead for some time.

"Live people don't understand, do they? . . . They're sort of shut up in little boxes, aren't they? . . . Look! Father Gibbs is bringing some of my flowers to you. He looks just like George, doesn't he? Oh, Mother Gibbs, I never realized how troubled and how . . . how in the dark live persons are. Look at him. I loved him so. From morning till night, that's all they are—troubled."

Yes, we frequently see little meaning in life. The rainy days and the snowed-in hours seem so unimportant, but how untrue! When Emily was trying to decide which day she wanted to relive, Mrs. Gibbs begged her, "At least, choose an unimportant day. Choose the least important day in your life. It will be important enough." What a vital principle for our living—no day is more important than another.

Emily learned one great lesson—she had missed the value of little things. One of the first things she noticed was the youthful face of her mother. She said to herself, "Oh! how young Mama looks! I didn't know Mama was ever that young." Imagine! She had missed her mother's face, but after all, many

of us do the same. The more Emily saw, the more she wanted to see. "I can't look at everything hard enough," was her response. Soon she became aware that her mother and the others whom she met did not see the things she saw—the little things which now seemed so significant. But—they were alive and she was dead. She was trying to relive a life that had already been lived. It was frightening to her to see all that had passed her by. She had even forgotten about the post-card album that George gave her on her birthday. It was so important now, but it really didn't matter much then.

Distraught over what she saw, she blurted out, "I can't go on. It goes so fast. We don't have time to look at one another. I didn't realize. So all that was going on and we never noticed." Do we ever take time to look at one another appreciatively? If you want to know some of the simple things that all of us miss, just listen to her words of farewell:

"Good-by, Good-by, world. Good-by, Grover's Corners . . . Mama and Papa. Good-by to clocks ticking . . . and Mama's sunflowers. And food and coffee. And new-ironed dresses and hot baths . . . and sleeping and waking up. Oh, earth, you're too wonderful for anybody to realize you."

And just before she returned to the dead, she turned and said to the Stage Manager, "Do any human beings ever realize life while they live it—every, every minute?" His reply was, "No." The main reason is because we look for the grandiose, the spectacular, the great, the famous, and the proud things. As a

result we miss the most important—the simple, the small, the humble, the minute things.

Possibly the poets come as near as anyone to a sense of the true values in life. Think about these lines from "Dust of Snow," by Robert Frost:

The way a crow
Shook down on me
The dust of snow
From a hemlock tree

Has given my heart
A change of mood
And saved some part
Of a day I had rued.

There it is—the appreciation of what we call an insignificant incident.

At death will we too be one of those who will want to come back to earth to live life over?

In the book of James there is a passage which says, "What after all, is your life? It is like a puff of smoke visible for a little while and then dissolving into thin air" (14:14, Phillips). When we reflect on the brevity and swiftness of our span of life, we are often apt to underestimate the value of our existence. Maybe we say to ourselves, "What is my life in comparison to the millions of others who have lived, are living, and will live?" The Christian Gospel proclaims that our growing up, our marrying, our living, and our dying are all part of God's order of life.

As Christians, we claim the name of a Savior who spoke about birds having nests, foxes having holes, and the beautiful lilies of the fields. He saw God's love in the simple. His simple life of sacrifice carried him to a cross where

he died to redeem insignificant people like you and me. Yet, to him we are significant, for the human soul is precious to him. Nothing was ordinary to Jesus, for God was the giver of life.

God has given us life on earth through creation and life in the Spirit through his Son Jesus Christ. The latter illumines the former and makes it

meaningful. We shall discover new values for our earthly life when we have received the life in the Spirit which is a demand of sacrificial love. This is the love which goes seeking, rather than staying home!

We have life! God gave it! What will we do with it? Remember, *it happens only once!*

PRAYER

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, we worship thee and ask for thy blessing.

We thank thee for the revelation of thyself in Jesus Christ our Lord, for the saving power of the Gospel, and for the gift of faith which inspires our hopes and quickens our spirits.

We thank thee for this occasion of fulfillment: for the love and sacrifice, the fidelity to the high calling, and the persistence of effort that now find fruition in this hour of consummation and praise.

We thank thee for this day of anticipation; for the vision of possibilities and opportunities open before us, for the will to have a part in Christian ministry that thy saving Word may be made known, and that increasingly the ways of the world may become avenues of thy grace.

We thank thee for the Church of Jesus Christ which unites us in faith and work. We thank thee for this Seminary where thy servants may have faith illumined and be trained and equipped for their work. We bless thee for the new manifestations of thy Spirit in the Church universal whereby love and devotion to thee enable us to transcend old differences, heal old wounds, and find new unity in our faith and work.

And now, O Lord, we earnestly ask for thy blessing. First we ask for these graduates that they may be effective instruments of thy Word and Spirit. Let the light of thy truth and the power of thy love be with them throughout their lives. When the terrible tides of evil threaten, protect and deliver them; when the will to do well falters, sustain them; when fellow-beings betray them, grant thy grace. O Lord our God, open for them wide doors of opportunity; give them the ability to serve thee and to honor thy great and holy name. Keep them faithful to the end.

We ask that all of us may find new resources in thy gifts to meet the trials of modern life. May we see the troubled waters as an opportunity for healing, and may we be ready and able to leap into them at the proper time. Enable us to see, above the darkness and the chaos of our lives, thy creative Spirit brooding over us. O God, let there be light. Fashion new order wherein we may live at peace with ourselves, with our fellow beings and with thee.

Gracious God, deliver us from the conceit that is so enamored of the present and of what we think we can do that memory becomes a mockery and hope a fettered, finite thing. Grant us the wisdom to look to the ages to sustain our age and to thy precious promises for our hope for a better day. And in all may we demonstrate our love by heeding thy commands.

We offer unto thee our thanksgiving and ask for thy blessing, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

(Prayer given during the 158th Commencement Exercises, June 2, 1970, by the Reverend John T. Galloway, D.D., Wayne Presbyterian Church, Wayne, Pennsylvania)

Dead Ends and New Beginnings

by BRUCE O. BOSTON

Acts 2:1-24

Sermon by Bruce O. Boston, an alumnus of Muskingum College and Princeton Theological Seminary. A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Theology in Ecumenics, Mr. Boston is the winner of three Fellowships: Church History (Princeton), Kent, and United Presbyterian Church Graduate Fellowship.

TODAY is Pentecost. Unfortunately Pentecost is often taken far too lightly as a day of celebration in the Church. Most people, for example, do not realize that after Easter and Christmas it ranks third in importance in our liturgical life. Pentecost is important in Christian history because it marks the "take off" point of the early Christians; it was on the first Pentecost that the gift of the Holy Spirit fell upon the Apostles in Jerusalem and set them into motion from Jerusalem to Judea and to the uttermost parts of the world. Indeed the day of which this Sunday is the anniversary is often spoken of as the "Birth-day of the Church." It is for this reason that Pentecost generally calls for sermons on the nature of the Church or on the Church's mission or on the tradition and heritage which is important for all of us.

On this occasion, however, I would like to resist the temptation of that particular impulse, which usually occurs to preachers at this time of year, and discuss something else with you. I would like to speak about Pentecost as an instance of a dead end and a new beginning, or to put it another way, as a paradigm of change.

Change seems to be "where it's at" these days. To say "change is what's happening" is more than a redundancy. I, at least, feel surrounded by it on all

sides. All of us are impressed by the extent to which our total lives and our environment are being re-structured by forces which few of us understand or can reasonably participate in. For instance, it has only been one generation since the first nuclear explosion and now men possess the power of planetary overkill to a degree undreamed of by men like Fermi, Oppenheimer, and Einstein. Time itself is collapsing, for as any I.B.M. executive can tell you, even the *generational* life of the greatest change agent in existence, the computer, is but a few brief years. "Rapid social change" has become a password to cocktail party relevance. We simply cannot keep up with what is happening to the family, marriage, sexual codes, living patterns and the emergence of new styles of life. Political change is also very much on the agenda today. There have been nearly forty new nations brought to life in Africa alone since we entered this past decade, and new power alignments continue to drive secretaries of state and foreign ministers up the walls. Industry and banking are not what they used to be either, and the re-emergence of conglomerates means that we no longer really know from whom we are buying or to whom we are selling. All of this economic, political, social and technological change is shot through with a sense of crisis

that grips me because I have begun to realize two very important things: first, that change is proceeding at such a pace as to have shattered the barrier of the mere quantitative and moved to qualitative change; and second, that the categories by which I once dealt with the processes of change in all these areas of life which I have mentioned have now broken down.

The neat boundary lines I once drew around my life, and the methods by which I came to terms with politics, society, science, and technology are being shattered by the battering ram of the future. The semi-organized chaos that we euphemistically label the "meg-alopolis," the pollution of our environment, the sterility of our politics, the rebellion of our youth, the increasing irrelevance of organized religion, and the revolution which threatens to devour our society whole . . . all these seem to point to the fact that we are at a dead end. We have outdistanced our ability to deal effectively with both our creative and destructive impulses. We do not know what the answers are anymore; we hardly know what the questions are.

(i)

What resources may we bring to bear on this problem? Do we as Christians have any place to turn which may assist us in moving through the crisis of change which plagues us? It is my contention that the answers to both these questions is at least a qualified "yes," and that as a starting point we may look at the Pentecost experience. The second chapter of the Book of Acts brings us face to face with a group of people who were very dissimilar to us

in many ways, but who were very much like us in at least one important respect. They, like us, had been overtaken by events. Consider what had happened to them in the space of eight short weeks. They had been carried to euphoric heights by the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, which they thought was the inaugural event of the kingdom Jesus had proclaimed and taught about. Then they had been plunged to the depths of despair by his arrest, trial, and crucifixion. Their hopes for themselves and for Israel had been riven through by the hard nails of Roman reality, and they saw three years going down the tubes. Then came the reports of the Resurrection, that he wasn't dead after all, that many of the disciples had seen him, talked to him, touched him. Then came the bewildering instruction to wait, to sit on their hands, to get ready for a new and mysterious mission. For eight weeks they had been on an emotional roller-coaster, and as they sat in that Upper Room they must have felt, more than anything else, a sense of confusion and brokenness. The changes had been too sudden and of too great an intensity for them to internalize into any coherent framework. They were confused about what had happened and what was happening to them. They did not know what to do next or where to go from here. There just weren't any handles.

So they mark time. They tread water looking for a place to swim. Once they thought they had found an answer. "Perhaps," they reasoned, "the problem lies with the organization." So, in search of a new direction they set about some institutional housekeeping in the hopes that things would be put

right again and they would get a clear image of their future purpose. They went through an elaborate ritual to replace Judas in order to bring the complement of the Apostles up to twelve again. Funny how, usually, when we're having problems finding direction we start making adjustments with the table of organization of the group. Somehow, we think, if we just do a little internal shifting, things will turn out all right. Well, they didn't turn out all right. When Matthias was awarded a key to the Apostolic executive washroom, it didn't provide a fresh start and a new direction. The attempt to restore the community to the *status quo ante* did not provide the galvanization for which everyone had hoped. So they continued to wait, and get bored, and worry. What they had experienced had overtaxed their abilities to cope and out-distanced their vision. They had been overwhelmed by change and none of the old ways of thinking or the old methods of coping were equal to the task of providing a way forward. Their own resources had been exhausted. They were at a dead end.

What happens to this group of people at this point is very interesting and also very instructive. Having reached the limits of their own personal and collective possibilities, they are suddenly transformed by something beyond themselves which the writer of acts describes as the Holy Spirit. Suddenly the dimensions of the Given were broken open by a power, a shift in consciousness for which they could not account and for which they were unprepared. The gift of the Spirit provides the galvanization which they sought. We must understand very

clearly what is happening here. This is not an instance of the acquisition of vision and a new sense of direction by means of resources provided by the past or by present experience, although both the past and the present now appear in a new light. All the possibilities which might have emerged from those quarters had been played out. The next step forward was not made by building on the past but by making a break with it, or to put it another way, this was not piecemeal change but radical change. The Apostles came to terms with their dead end by opting themselves for qualitative change, responding to the new reality which confronted them. They were able to enter into a new and different style of life for which experience had not prepared them, but which nevertheless made sense to them and brought meaning to their situation.

(ii)

It may be objected that the Holy Spirit was not an unknown in the religious life of the people of Israel, and that the Apostles ought to have had some sense of what they *might* expect. This is, of course, true, but only to a relative degree. The prophets, especially in their more ecstatic moments, had understood themselves to be possessed by the Spirit. In the period immediately after the occupation of Canaan, for example, the leadership of Israel had emerged at various times in the form of individuals called Judges, on whom the Spirit had come to rest at specific times for specific purposes. But, as our passage shows, what the Apostles experienced at Pentecost was not a repetition of what had happened before. The Holy Spirit was now general in its manifesta-

tion, not particular. It was collectively present, not just in individuals. It was continuing and not temporary. This life in the Spirit was a new thing which took them by storm.

The coming of the Holy Spirit represents a new paradigm, a new lens through which reality jumps into clearer focus. It is a *new way* of experiencing things so that movement is possible from the dead ends of the present to the new beginnings of the future. The coming of the Holy Spirit represents a decisive break with the old self-understandings of this apostolic community. They no longer see themselves as bound to the confusions of their immediate past, but are now able to articulate a perspective on that past which makes sense not only to them, but also to those to whom they preach. This is not a repeat of the past or even a renewal in the present, but a moving beyond both to a new threshold of understanding, vision and commitment. In the coming of the Spirit the Apostles recognize that the crisis of confidence in the old paradigms, the breakdown of the old categories by which they had understood themselves in relation to Jesus and to their world, had provided a milieu in which a new paradigm could emerge.

(iii)

There are, of course, dangers when we opt for a new paradigm. In the first place there is the danger, experienced by the Apostles themselves, that you will get mocked. They were accused of being drunk because they opted for the new paradigm of the Spirit. Galileo was tried as a heretic because he opted for the new paradigm which said that

the earth moved around the sun and not vice versa. More recently the "hippies" are mocked because they have opted for a style of life which most people find foolish and unrealistic, and the "new left" is condemned because many find their analysis of our society incredible and their methods of making changes unacceptable. But, if Pentecost says anything it says that we need to entertain the possibility of new paradigms, especially at crisis points, because it may well be that the prophecies of the sons and daughters, the visions of the young men and the dreams of the old ones (Joel 2:28-32) may in fact be the stuff of which a new paradigm is made. One might even go so far as to say that the more out of joint with the present a new paradigm is, the more seriously we ought to take the possibility that it may be a new articulation of the spirit.

Another danger with opting for the new paradigm is that we will become faddists who mistake form for substance. This appears to me to be what has happened in the so-called "glossolalia movement" which is becoming prevalent across the Church. Here we see many serious Christians devoting their spiritual energy in the acquisition of the "gift of tongues," mistaking the outward manifestation for the inner reality. But surely the point of Pentecost is not that the Apostles all spoke in tongues, but that they came into contact with a new resource to move them beyond their dead end, enabling them to make a new beginning, forming a new community with a new vision of reality and a new commitment to change.

(iv)

In seeking the significance of Pentecost for today the greatest mistake that we could make, the greatest violation of the central meaning of that experience for the Apostles and the early Church, would be to try to repeat it verbatim. It is true that we, like they, are trapped in a dead end existence, marked by racism and poverty at home, increasing militarism abroad, the breakdown of worn-out political, social and cultural forms which once made sense, but which now appear to be taking on the character of criminality. But that does not mean that we need to spend our time listening for the sound of a mighty wind, or looking for tongues of flame or their twentieth century equivalents.

It may be true that too much of our collective energy is being dissipated, playing around with Matthias type answers to Pentecost type problems, fiddling with institutional and structural arrangements, trying to return to the securities and stabilities of "the good old days." But none of this means that we must do all over again what was once done in Jerusalem fifty days after that Passover when Jesus was crucified. For the very heart of Pentecost is that dead ends, in the providence and grace of God, lead to *new* beginnings, not old ones warmed over. Pentecost means sensitivity to the new thing that God is doing in our midst. It means being called out of the blind alleys of the present into responsible engagement with the world around us for the sake of the future. It means attempting to discern that reality which beckons us from beyond the givens of our present crises, and hang-ups, and draws us

towards a new paradigm for a new age. Pentecost means that the dead end is not the last word, but only the next to last—before the new beginning breaks in with all its power.

Clearly we are in need of a new Pentecost, and perhaps we may offer some preliminary indications of what it may look like—but with the proviso that we are willing, and even hope, to be surprised.

I.

In the first place I think that a new Pentecost is called for in order to discover how the Church must move in order to break out of the choke hold of its present form. This is not merely a problem of finding new institutional shapes, or of overcoming what has been called the "morphological fundamentalism" of the Church, but as with the Apostles, it is a matter of discovering who we are as a community all over again, a problem of gaining a vision of the whole instead of micro-analysis of the parts, a problem of forging a new framework for our common life. This will probably mean that buildings, parishes, preaching, Sunday school and all vestiges of denominational identity will be forsaken in favor of a much more *ad hoc* communal style. We shall have to apply ourselves to the learning and use of completely new modes of communication, personal relationship, education, political life, liturgy and social organization in order to respond creatively to the new paradigm which beckons us out of the mire of present chaos.

2.

I suspect that Christians will be obliged to move toward a new sectar-

ianism in order to discover their identity. We most likely will have to learn to generate creative conflict and let the ministry of reconciliation lie fallow for a while. We will have to run the risk of getting mocked for having dangerous ideas. If American society continues to move in its present direction, that of repressing virile political and social forces, we Christians will have to move into opposition to the establishment instead of trying to move it inch by inch from inside. We will have to learn the survival skills of a remnant. We may

have to develop not *changed* institutions but *counter*-institutions in order to bear witness to the new reality which grasps us. All of these things are possibilities, but the *reality* is that in the midst of the dead end, a new beginning becomes not only a hope, but the very possibility which *God brings about*. Thus, the message of Pentecost is that while we may not yet have the answers, or may not yet see the shape of the new paradigm, Pentecost at least helps us ask some of the right questions.

Understanding Your Church Curriculum

by D. CAMPBELL WYCKOFF

Thomas W. Synnott Professor of Christian Education at Princeton Theological Seminary, Dr. Wyckoff was chairman, Department of Religious Education, New York University, 1950-1954. The author of seven books, he is widely known as an educator and adviser on theological curriculum. He has served as visiting professor at Syracuse University and Union Theological Seminary, New York. This lecture was given at the Southern Baptist Religious Education Association, Denver, Colorado, May 31, 1970.

THE CURRICULUM of Christian education is the systematic plan by which the church seeks to fulfill its teaching ministry. The church has a teaching ministry, directed toward adults, for renewal, and toward children and youth, for nurture and decision. The curriculum is the plan for implementation of this ministry.

The curriculum is not the whole of Christian education. A major portion of the education of the Christian is informal, unplanned, and spontaneous. But it is inconceivable that a faithful church would try to do its educational work without a plan, and the curriculum is that plan, supplementing and to a degree shaping the informal, unplanned, spontaneous elements.

We need to be clear that curriculum is primarily a matter of planning and carrying out an enterprise, an activity. Only in a secondary sense may curriculum be properly thought of as materials. The materials function to suggest activities and plans through which the learning enterprise, what I have called "the live curriculum," may spring to life. The materials are thus instrumental to the curriculum, which properly is a vital transaction involving the learner, the teacher, and the living God.

Thus, in the most concrete terms, and

in all its complexity, we may say that the curriculum of Christian education includes:

- Plans for the Sunday church school.
- Plans for youth activities, on Sunday evenings, for instance.
- Plans for various kinds of adult study and action groups.
- Plans and resources for summer (vacation school, camp, and conference), weekday, and other times.
- Plans and resources for groups representing special needs (the institutionalized, the armed forces, etc.).
- Plans for parochial and other church-related schools.
- Plans for religion in higher education.
- Plans for Christian family education.
- Plans for informal para-parochial educational ministries.
- Plans for a variety of other settings and needs.

And . . .

Materials produced and distributed by denominations and others to guide and implement these plans (including help on setting up the program; methods and plans for leading, teaching, and learning; and resource material for use in the enterprise: books, pictures, audio-visuals, etc.).

In order to forward sound and intelligent planning, the various persons and groups responsible for curriculum need clearly understood and carefully agreed on guidelines, in the form of curriculum principles that add up to a sound, coherent, and useful curriculum theory. The purpose of theory, hopefully sound and coherent, is its usefulness in the critical and constructive examination of practice—before that practice takes place, while it is still in the form of plans; during the time that it is taking place; and after it has taken place, in the form of evaluation.

It is our purpose here to set forth a curriculum theory in the form of seven fundamental principles—sound, coherent, and practical. Six of these seven principles comprise those elements of curriculum thinking that require the closest theological and educational attention. The seventh principle, the organizing principle of the curriculum, synthesizes the rest. Thus our attention may be focused on the search for the organizing principle of the curriculum of Christian education, assuming that in the process we will have to be clear about the six elementary curriculum principles.

The problem of an organizing principle for the curriculum is as complex a question as any that the curriculum builder has to face. When we seek an organizing principle, we are seeking an answer to the question, "What is the soundest possible basis upon which the educational plan of the church may be put together?" At least the following complexities arise immediately: First, the principle must be sound; that is, it must "test out" in every possible way: theologically, biblically, scientifically,

educationally, and practically under every conceivable circumstance. Second, the principle must be educational; that is, it must both reflect and reveal the very nature and process by which the most profound changes in human being and becoming take place. Third, it must be genuinely in and of the church; that is, it must grow out of and express the life and mission of God's faithful people as they engage in the worship, witness, and work that is theirs to do. Thus, in raising the question of an organizing principle, we are raising the questions, vast and prior, of theology, biblical studies, the "man sciences," education, and the life and mission of the church as Christ's community.

One feels constrained to linger over these questions, and not to plunge ahead too fast to say how the curriculum ought to be put together. Such hesitation might in the long run prove economical, for it is certain that to plunge ahead with curriculum planning without attention to these basic questions could only result in decisions that would later have to be reconsidered, and action that might be regretted as new evidence comes to light. Christian education and the curriculum are dependent upon leadership and insight from theologians, biblical scholars, social scientists, educators, and the living church. When they change their minds and direction at all fundamentally, Christian education and the curriculum have corresponding readjustments to make. The Christian educator and the curriculum person must weigh these changes, determine their educational implications, and follow through with the building and rebuilding involved, seeking to keep the lag between new insight and educa-

tional validation and implementation as short as possible.

But the practical curriculum decisions cannot wait for any leisurely reconsideration of the basic assumptions upon which we work. We must manage to "keep up with things," to sort things out so that our "up-to-dateness" may be both valid and useable, and thus arrive at decisions and take action that we are convinced are right. At the same time we must be ready and willing to modify our decisions and action as new evidence, both academic and practical, is produced.

What we want is a forthright basis for putting the curriculum together, decisive enough to tell us what to do, and at the same time responsibly tentative.

* * * * *

Having said this, I suppose that it is up to me to say where I think we are theologically, biblically, behaviorally, educationally, and ecclesiastically. This is tempting, but let a summary of these matters suffice, put in the form of answers to the six questions that Christian education and the curriculum have to ask and to answer—the six questions that spotlight curriculum's elementary principles.

1) What is the objective of Christian education? That is, what is Christian education's point and purpose? The statement of the National Council of Churches brings recent thought into focus: "The objective of Christian education is that all persons be aware of God's self-disclosure, and especially his seeking love in Jesus Christ, and that they respond in faith and love, to the end that they may know who they are and what their human situation means,

grow as sons of God rooted in the Christian community, live in the Spirit of God in every relationship, fulfill their common discipleship in the world, and abide in the Christian hope." This is a comprehensive, balanced, and incisive statement by which the enterprise may be planned, guided, and judged.

2) What is the scope of Christian education? That is, what is to be dealt with or covered by way of subject matter and experience? The briefest adequate answer is that the scope of Christian education is the whole field of relationships—God, man, nature, and history—in light of the gospel. Christian education deals with the rethinking and re-experiencing of our concerns because of and in light of God's self-disclosure and especially his seeking love in Jesus Christ. God has created, loved, chosen, judged, and redeemed; in Jesus Christ he has come, lived, died, risen, and ascended; his Holy Spirit moves among us. This changes our whole field of relationships, everything we might think about him, about man, about ourselves, about nature, and about history. Thus, Christian education has a "special" content (revelation and the gospel) with a universal reference (to our whole field of relationships).

3) Where may Christian education carry on its work with integrity? That is, what is its proper context, considering its character, its rootage, and its functions? We must be careful, for the obvious and correct answer is "the church." Yet this might be badly misinterpreted to mean that Christian education and the curriculum are set within the church in isolation from the world. The correct meaning of the church as the setting or context for

Christian education is that Christian education partakes of the whole objective and mission of the church, in teaching persons about that objective and mission and in leading persons to undertake the church's mission and ministry intelligently and effectively. Furthermore, the church as the context for Christian education means that as the church is involved with the world, so is Christian education; and that Christian education may well serve to bring to the church many of the world's concerns (intellectual, moral, social, and personal) of which the church might not otherwise be adequately aware.

4) What is the process of Christian education? The question here is the "how" of Christian education: how Christian learning and teaching take place. We have learned that this is a much more profound question than that of methodological tricks-of-the-trade, for the methods by which persons "be and become" in the Christian faith and life are actually the basic ways in which God, man, nature, and history interact for educational results. (This is a point that Paul Payne first brought home to me in a critical review of the chapter on method in my first book, *The Task of Christian Education*. One of my major concerns ever since has been to explore the meaning and implications of this matter.)

The manner in which God, man, nature, and history interact educationally has been somewhat clarified of late by the concept of "learning tasks" in Christian education. Persons "be and become" in the Christian faith and life through undertaking the learning tasks of listening with growing alertness to the gospel and responding in faith and

love. Such listening and responding, however, require first that persons undertake the task of assuming personal and social responsibility. (They must be seriously launched upon the business of life; they must have an investment in life that is demanding and motivating. Note, by the way, that the tiny infant may be said to be seriously launched upon life and that he has a motivating investment in life that mobilizes all his powers of listening and responding.) Listening with growing alertness to the gospel and responding in faith and love require, second, that persons engage over and over again in a cycle of learning tasks: exploring the field of relationships in light of the gospel, discovering meaning and value in the field of relationships in light of the gospel, and appropriating that meaning and value personally. (I have come to think that there may be some value in stating this cycle in a slightly different way, viz.: exploring the field of relationships, discovering meaning and value in the field of relationships, appropriating that meaning and value personally, and experiencing the conversion of meaning and value in light of the gospel.)

The process of Christian education has been further clarified by the concept that Christian learning takes place through involvement of persons in the life and work of the church. This of course requires a view of the life and work of the church that is both theological and functional, a view that sees the church as a living body of response to God's revelation, carrying on the functions of worship, study, action (witness, service, and social action), stewardship, fellowship (the common

life, and outreach), and the creative expression of its faith and life (in the spoken word, music, and the other arts). Involvement in the life and work of the church cannot be narrowly confining if such a theological and functional view is taken. Involvement must of course be appropriately selective, depending upon the person's background, capabilities and limitations, time of life, situation, opportunities, motivations, and concerns. (It is here, perhaps, that the practical complexities with which the curriculum's organizing principle has to deal become most obvious.)

What we know about the process of Christian education may then be summed up by saying that Christian learning and teaching require personal involvement in the life and work of the church, that involvement being of such a nature that the learning tasks are systematically undertaken.

5) Who is involved in Christian education? Who are the persons who are partners to the educational transaction, and what are their roles? There are simple and narrow ways of answering this question: pupils and teachers, group members and leaders, and special educational institutions and agencies. Without going into the matter in detail, an observation or two may be made. First, Christian education genuinely carried on involves learners (who are learning in many different settings and in many different ways, most of them not connected with the church), teachers (who are themselves learners, but who in this connection also act as guides who invite learners into educational experiences), and God himself (whose Holy Spirit is the teacher, thus requiring that human learners and teachers conduct

their enterprise in an atmosphere of prayer and of receptivity to his leading). Second, Christian education takes place both in planned and unplanned ways, the most telling work being carried on, no doubt, in unplanned ways in the family, community, and church as one sees another grappling with the problems of the Christian faith and life and accepts or rejects what he sees. Third, since the curriculum is the educational plan by which the church seeks to fulfill its teaching ministry, it is the major instrument of the planned side of Christian education and thus requires the most careful structuring of the roles of learners and teachers, and the most careful anticipation of the work of God's Spirit in their midst.

6) When does Christian education take place? The matter of timing has several aspects. There is the learner's time: his readiness, and the schedule that is determined by his motivations and plans. There is God's time: the movement of his will and acts, sensitivity to which is the key to faithful response. There is "occasional" time: that of nature and human history, significant emergent events and trends in our environment and in our social and community life and culture. There is the church's time: by which it uses the past (tradition) and the future (its anticipation of God's will, emergent environmental factors, and emergent human needs) to determine the steps to be taken now and in the future in order that its response may be faithful. Contemporary thought seems to indicate that God reveals his timing basically in the scripture, and provides the clues to the timing of our response primarily through the decision-making oppor-

tunities provided by "occasional" time. God's time and "occasional" time provide the orientation for the church's time, which in turn provides the orientation for the Christian learner's time.

* * * * *

With answers to these six questions, we are in a position to look directly at the organizing principle. The function of the organizing principle of the curriculum is to provide the guidance that curriculum builders need to fit these six pieces together so as to know what they are about as they do curriculum planning. The organizing principle must show how the *persons* involved may, within the *context*, *time* their use of the *process* in order that the *scope* may be covered and the *purpose* fulfilled. Yet this must be done as clearly and manageably as possible. Complex as the matter is, it may thus be brought within manageable compass. Indeed it must be, if both soundness and practicality are to be maintained in curriculum construction.

A very great deal of thought and work have been given recently to the formulation of the organizing principle of the curriculum. Some have maintained that logical continuity, the gradual unfolding of the logic of the faith, is the key; others have maintained that the basic principle ought to be that of psychological continuity, by which the Christian faith and life are made relevant to the person's developing capacities and needs. There is some indication that any organizing principle that is suggested beyond these is likely to include both, but with some distinctive balance and emphasis by which they may be unified and held together. The suggestion of continual Christian learn-

ings correlated with continuous life involvements is an excellent combination of the two, and has been worked out in great detail. The use of existential questions of central concern at various age and experience levels also manages the combination in excellent fashion.

The organizing principle that I find most suggestive might also be thought of as a way of negotiating between the logic of the faith (content) and personal factors (experience). I believe that it does encompass these and focus them properly, yet it does so by putting them in a different context, that of the responsively changing life of the church.

Thus, instead of the person's developing experience of the content of the faith as such, I believe that the organizing principle of the curriculum should be *the church's experience*. There are two immediate advantages here. First, the impossibility of organizing the curriculum in terms of many different lines of developing individual experience is overcome by emphasis upon corporate experience of a type that catches up all the values of individual experience and yet keeps them properly focused for Christian education. Second, the value of experience as a factor in the organization of curriculum is conserved, thus promising that the curriculum will not become statically formalized as subject matter, but will rather remain free, responsive, and creative.

But more needs to be said about what is meant by "the church's experience." God in Christ has called the church, constituted it, given it its assignment, and empowered it. The church's experience includes the various aspects of its response to its call, constitution, assignment, and empowerment. The church's experience is its life and work as in

personal and group experience the great concerns of the Christian faith and the Christian life are dealt with and its objective sought.

Clearly, I want the curriculum of Christian education to be heavy on the "subject matter" side. The call of the church needs to be known, discussed, understood, and its implications (past, present, and future) sought. So do the constitution of the church, its assignment, and its empowerment. But all is to be focused on the decision-making and action involved in being the church here and now. What is called for is theology as subject matter and as method: theology that seeks out and comes to grips with the sources of revelation (biblical studies); theology that traces the response to revelation through the course of the interchange of church and world in history and in the contemporary scene (church history); theology that seeks to say the truth in our language (systematic theology); theology that seeks to determine the right for our actual situation (ethics); and theology that suggests adequate modes of response for the church as Christ's faithful people today (practical theology). Theology, in other words, is a thing to be studied, since it provides rootage, background, and methodological experience. It is also a thing to be created, since it is both a response in itself and a guide to other modes of response to God's will. In this sense, the curriculum is to be organized as engagement in the theological task.

Perhaps, however, this is not the best way to put it. Let me try it another way, which for me says the same thing. The curriculum may be organized in terms of the modes of the church's life and work as these are genuine expres-

sions of its response to the gospel. By this I mean that the curriculum may be organized as a means of educating persons through involvement in worship, study, action, stewardship, fellowship, and creative expression, as these express response to God's self-disclosure and seeking love in Jesus Christ. Naturally, education is not a matter of throwing people willy-nilly into experiences that are supposed to educate them. Involvement in the modes of the church's experience, its life and work means participation in worship, study, action, stewardship, fellowship, and creative expression in a cycle of orientation, engagement, reflection, re-orientation, re-engagement, reflection, and so on. Education cannot by any means claim the whole cycle. Education's task is primarily with orientation and reflection: orientation to worship, mission, social action, and the rest as prelude to engagement, and reflection upon the experiences of engagement in order to determine what has really happened, what it means, and what next step or level is indicated. Tremendous amounts of teaching and learning are implied in such orientation and reflection, specific and voluminous subject matter is required, an atmosphere of functional apprenticeship is to be maintained, and anticipation of and readiness to accept new light and new direction is to be encouraged.

If, then, the organizing principle of the curriculum is the church's experience, the heart of the matter is involvement, with all our varied needs and developing experience, in the life and work of the worshiping and witnessing community in a cycle of orientation, action, and reflection. This means coming face-to-face with the gospel; seeing

the relevance of the gospel to the understanding of all of life; accepting the promises and implications of the Christian faith; becoming committed to membership in the worshiping and witnessing community and to full discipleship in the world; participating personally in the very life and work of the church in the world; and undertaking the learning tasks through which the life and work of the community find expression, and through which the Christian faith and life may be known and appropriated.

* * * * *

Just two more observations. First, it strikes me that this organizing principle implies that history is the heart of the matter, if by history is meant the give-and-take of God's action and man's response past, present, and in anticipation of the future. Learning takes place through decision-making and action, which is the creation of history. Responsible decision-making requires light from the past in the form of content and seasoned experience, and also requires focus upon the future, since present decision and action set the conditions for future decision and action. What I am hinting at is that history, thus broadly conceived, may be a way of catching up, understanding, and using the church's experience as the organizing principle. This also hints that story-telling may be Christian education's irreducibly basic approach to content.

The final observation is that the use of the church's experience as the organizing principle might require drastic relocation of curriculum decision-making and planning. Insofar as the

church's experience is genuinely lived and guided at the denomination level, curriculum decision-making and planning would remain there. Yet I believe that less and less that is really telling happens at that level. The real life of the church is lived at the local and ecumenical levels. To organize the curriculum in terms of the church's experience at the local level is to create the educational plan locally. To organize the curriculum in terms of the church's experience at the ecumenical level is to see that all Christian education everywhere is genuinely sensitive and responsive to the universals of the faith and their inescapably world-wide implications. Let the organization of basic imperatives and thrusts be accomplished at the ecumenical level; let the specific educational plan be organized at the local level; let the denomination (or some more functional mode of decentralization) act as an agency for producing resource materials that will enable the local level to be ecumenical in character, and for providing the supervisory services that will make local planning practicable and effective. But let the enterprise take definitive shape where it must happen—at the local level. Curriculum planning in the most profound sense must take place where we live our faith and work out our discipleship. We need all the guidance and all the resources that ecumenical, national, and regional Christian educators can possibly give us. But in the long run what actually happens depends upon the plans we make and carry out—the curriculum we make with all these resources—where we live our life and work out our discipleship.

The COCU Liturgy: Intent versus Content

by LAURENCE H. STOOKEY

A graduate student in the doctoral program in Homiletics and Liturgics, Laurence H. Stookey has been an Instructor at Princeton Seminary since 1967. He is an alumnus of Swarthmore College and Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C. This article is his answer to a request in his comprehensive doctoral examination for a critical appraisal of the COCU Liturgy.

THE Commission on Worship of The Consultation on Church Union has prepared for the consideration of its member denominations *An Order of Worship for the Proclamation of the Word of God and the Celebration of the Lord's Supper with Commentary*. This *Order* is recommended for experimental use and evaluation.¹ Because this work represents a serious liturgical proposal but is by no means a fixed and final form, it deserves careful consideration and response. It should neither be dismissed because it is tentative, nor accepted uncritically because it is new and has attached to it an impressive list of liturgical scholars and sources. The purpose of this critique is to examine the intent of the service as set forth in the commentary and the content as found in the liturgical text itself.

I

The clear intent of the COCU liturgy is to unite Word and Sacrament in the life of the worshipping church. The ultimate goal is a weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper in each congrega-

tion. The pattern most of us have followed for generations militates against the immediate realization of this goal; the Commission on Worship recognizes this, and evolution, not revolution, is its apparent strategy. In the interim, however, the Eucharistic order is to be normative for the shape of non-Eucharistic corporate worship. That is, in place of the two disparate orders most of us have had (one for Communion Sundays and a second for other Sundays), there will be a single service. On Communion Sundays this is used in its entirety; on other Sundays it stops short of the spreading of the Lord's Table. But always there is the same Preparation and the same service of The Proclamation of the Word of God. Thus the worshippers do not have to shift gears when the Sacrament is celebrated; they simply continue on into the service of The Lord's Supper. Ideally, the Sacrament will not be viewed as something optional, to be tacked on for special occasions. Instead, the non-sacramental service will be seen as truncated, crying out for completion and preparing us for the Lord's Supper which (it is to be hoped) will be celebrated no more than two or three Sundays hence.

From the perspective of this critic, the intent of the COCU service is laud-

¹ If copies cannot be obtained locally, they may be ordered from: The Consultation on Church Union, 228 Alexander St., Princeton, N.J. 08540. The cost is \$.25 per copy, plus postage. Evaluations of the liturgy should be sent to the same address in care of The Rev. Dr. Paul A. Crow, Jr., General Secretary.

able in every way. It is clear that the architects of the liturgy have read their Gregory Dix.² The Preparation consists of a greeting, an act of praise, and an act of penitence (Dix's "second stratum" plus accretions). The Proclamation of the Word of God contains the lessons (a Gospel reading for every Sunday with Old and New Testament lessons also suggested, and with adequate provision for the Psalter), the sermon, affirmation of faith, peace, and prayers. (When the Sacrament is not celebrated, the service may then be concluded with the offering, thanksgiving, and dismissal.) The Lord's Supper embodies Dix's fourfold shape of taking, blessing, breaking, and giving; these actions are clearly marked as The Offertory, The Thanksgiving, The Breaking of Bread, and The Communion. The Eucharistic section is then concluded with praise and the dismissal (again, the "second stratum"). The extreme subjectivity which afflicted medieval piety and made its way into Cranmer's service is gone; there is a return to an objective, corporate understanding of worship.

While some fundamentalist groups can maintain a weekly celebration simply on the basis of primitive practice as recorded in *The Acts*, the rest of us need a sturdy sacramental theology to support the concept of the Eucharist as normative for Christian worship. The notes on "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper" at the end of the COCU document provide just such a base.³ There it is stated that our Lord "continues, throughout all time, to make the grace

and power of his presence known to those who believe in him" through the Supper which "is both sign and sacrament of its [i.e., the Church's] unity, its mission, and its promise." Furthermore, the Supper exhibits "the full reality of the Church—past, present, and future." A paragraph is devoted to each of these aspects of time:

The Supper is a memorial feast that celebrates what Jesus Christ accomplished for the salvation of the world. . . . Christian disciples recall with joy and thanksgiving the wondrous, once-for-all gift of his redeeming work and promise of eternal life. They contemplate its inexhaustible mystery and benefit, and pledge themselves anew in commitment to its gospel.

The Supper is no mere commemoration of a past and glorious event. Jesus Christ lives and abides with his Church forever. . . . The presence of Christ among his own, here and now, in grace and power and judgment, presiding and serving at his banquet table, is an inescapable reality for all who meet him in the Supper. It is, in fact, a holy communion. This living encounter evokes penitence, faith, love, joy. It mediates forgiveness, reconciliation, hope, encouragement, consolation, and spiritual strength. The Supper is Christ's immediate means of grace—making up what is lacking, supporting what is weak, confirming what is good, and empowering what is needful.

The Supper is also a real participation in the final end of the redeemed—the Messianic banquet which the

² Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre Press, 1945).

³ *An Order*, pp. 73-75.

Lord prepares and makes ready in his Kingdom. . . . In the Supper our ascended Lord lifts up his embattled followers on earth in union with the triumphant hosts of heaven in adoration of the holy.

These are strange and glorious words to those who too long have endured the morose proceedings which make the Lord's Supper appear to be a funeral for sweet Jesus rather than the heavenly marriage feast at which our Lord himself presides.

II

The ideal of a weekly celebration coupled with a high view of the nature of the Sacrament would lead us to expect a strong liturgy. But does the content of the service reflect its intent? It is at this point, I think, that we must be prepared for disappointment with regard to the present COCU document. When the Eucharistic section of the liturgy is examined, it does not measure up to the meaning of the Supper set forth in the Commentary and Appended Notes or to the weekly ideal. To support this assertion, let us look at the service of The Lord's Supper more closely.

The Offertory begins with an allusion to the Lord's revelation of himself in the breaking of bread at Emmaus. But there is nothing to indicate whether we are to expect him with us in a similar manner, or whether we are merely to keep a memorial of that event. The invitation—if it can be called that—is distressingly brief: "Come then to the joyful feast of the Lord. Let us prepare his table with the offerings of our life and labor." Thus the opening of the Eucharistic portion of the liturgy suf-

fers from ecumenical blur: What is the Supper? Who may come to the Lord's Table? There is no indication.

A suggested prayer at the close of the Offertory is somewhat better with reference to the presence of Christ in the Supper. But when compared to its immediate source (the Church of South India liturgy), it is strangely cautious:

CSI:

Be present, be present, O Jesus, thou good High Priest, as thou wast in the midst of thy disciples, and make thyself known to us in the breaking of the bread. . . .

COCU:

Heavenly Father, may the Lord Jesus Christ, our great High Priest, be present with us as he was among his disciples, and make himself known to us in the breaking of the bread. . . .

In any event, the use of this prayer is optional; and since it is at the end of a series of alternate uses, it is apt to be snubbed in actual practice.

The next element of the Eucharistic order is the Prayer of Thanksgiving. It is divided into three sections. The first renders praise to God for creation and redemption. But in spite of the fact that thanksgiving is offered for many aspects of the ministry of our Lord, there is no mention of his ministry in the Supper. The second section of the great prayer is the *Anamnesis*; it incorporates the Words of Institution of I Corinthians xi, and recalls that "our Savior Jesus Christ, before he suffered, gave us this memorial of his sacrifice, until his coming again." While the notes on the Supper stated that it "is no mere commemoration of a past and

glorious event," the memorial aspect is the only one clearly mentioned in the text. (Let Zwinglians exult!) An eschatological note is sounded briefly at the end of the middle section of the Prayer of Thanksgiving; but when compared with its source (Church of South India), the COCU version seems less immediate:

CSI:

Thy death, O Lord, we commemorate.
Thy resurrection we confess.
And thy second coming we await.

Glory be to thee, O Christ.

COCU:

His death, O God, we proclaim.
His resurrection we declare.
His coming we await.

Glory be to you, O Lord.

The revision is distressing. If our Lord is really present "among his own, here and now, in grace and power and judgment, presiding and serving at his banquet table," then how is it we speak about him as if he were not here? Have the authors of this liturgy not read Gregory Dix carefully enough to feel the sting of his quip that Protestants have a doctrine of "the real absence of Christ" in the Eucharist?⁴

The Prayer of Thanksgiving concludes with the *Epiclesis*, Prayer of Oblation, and the Lord's Prayer. This

final section is as vague with regard to a theology of consecration as are the two which precede it. At first reading the *Epiclesis* may appear adequate: "... show forth among us the presence of your life-giving Word and Holy Spirit, to sanctify us and your whole Church through these holy mysteries." Then one recalls the words of the *American Book of Common Prayer*: "Bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine." Suddenly there is the realization that in the COCU *Epiclesis* the elements are virtually ignored: To ask God to sanctify us through the holy mysteries is not the same as asking him to sanctify the bread and wine or even "both us and these thy gifts of bread and wine" as in the Presbyterian *Book of Common Worship*. The problem is compounded by the COCU Prayer of Oblation which contains this petition: "Gracious Father, accept with favor this our sacrifice of praise, which we now present *with* these holy gifts" [*italics mine*]. Are the bread and wine not a part of our sacrifice of praise; are they not also to be accepted? It is as if we and these holy gifts were on separate, parallel tracks, headed goodness-knows-where.

At the Fraction, responsive sentences based on I Corinthians 10:16-17 are provided. Additional sentences may be

or excised—as, indeed, will the *Gloria in excelsis* and the *Te Deum laudamus* in the COCU synaxis. Further, such an explanation of the above revision assumes that "Lord" in the last line is used in the Old Testament sense. If the final words are addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ, however, the rationale of the revision becomes wholly inexplicable.

⁴ There is, of course, a school of liturgical thought which asserts that praise and prayer should not be offered *to* Christ, but only *through* Christ *to* the Father. Perhaps such a conviction has produced the revision of this and of the prayer at the end of the Offertory section noted above. But the whole concept is open to debate; and if it is not proper to address Christ directly, large sections of our hymnals will have to be revised

used at the Communion and the latter include the traditional *Benedictus qui venit*. These two sets of responses may be seen as indicating a high view of the Sacrament; but the statement of that view is still open to variant interpretations; and the responses are not mandatory in any case. The Words of Distribution ("The body of Christ, the bread of heaven"; "The blood of Christ, the cup of salvation") circumvent the "This is my body"/"This represents my body" quandary. But they by no means solve it. Thus there is a theological haziness in the central portion of the liturgy.

This is not to suggest that the service should attempt to explain the manner of our Lord's presence. That is a mystery and must remain so. But the liturgy needs to assert more clearly the reality of that presence. What we have now in the content of the COCU service is a sort of theological Rorschach test: Everyone reads his own presuppositions into it. Memorialists can be perfectly happy. Anyone with a higher doctrine of the Sacrament can accommodate it; but will not a gnawing uneasiness afflict him?

The uneasiness is intensified when we consider what has been omitted from the Eucharistic portion of the liturgy. As noted earlier, there is no clear Invitation, much less an Exhortation or Fencing of the Table. Cranmer's Invitation has been moved to the synaxis and changed into a bidding before the confession. In the process, the heart has been cut out of it: The words "and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort" are deleted. In the *Book of Common Prayer* the Invitation elevated the significance of the Eucharist by its position in the order and pointed to one

important function of the Sacrament by its wording. Both are destroyed in the COCU revision.

In a similar manner, the Peace has been moved to the synaxis and thus changed in significance. The Peace has historically been the peripatetic element of the liturgy; but while there is ample precedent for moving it from place to place, there is no historic basis for taking it out of the Eucharistic section. The rationale given is that after the Church affirms its faith through the Creed, it is fitting to express "our love for our fellows." This critic is certainly not opposed to such expressions of love. But the point of reserving the Peace for sacramental celebrations is to assert that in the Communion of the body and blood of our Lord we are united to our fellows in a singular and peculiar way. The significance of both the Sacrament and the nature of Christian love are thereby elevated. The COCU placement of the Peace says nothing about the special nature of our Table fellowship (for it is to be used whether the Sacrament is celebrated or not); and since it immediately follows the Creed, the Peace may appear to suggest that our love springs from doctrinal agreement rather than from him who is the object of doctrinal formulations—our host at the Supper.

Those familiar with liturgies in the Calvinist tradition will miss the Fencing of the Table, the Scriptural Warrent, and the Setting Apart of the Elements from common to sacred use. The collective absence of these at the outset of the Liturgy of the Upper Room amounts to a further devaluation of the Sacrament. Since there is no indication as to who may come to the Table, one

may assume, if he wishes, that it is totally open. Even Methodists who pride themselves on an open communion have never been that permissive and have at least followed Cranmer in specifying that the Table is for those who truly and earnestly repent of their sins, are in love and charity with their neighbors, and intend to lead a new life. In reply to the objection that the Scriptural Warrant is missing, someone may point out that the Words of Institution are in the *Anamnesis*. That fact notwithstanding, there is considerable merit in placing the Warrant at the outset of the Eucharistic liturgy. This again defines and elevates the Sacrament. The same may be said of the Setting Apart of the Elements. Here is a practice worthy of emulation by those outside of the Calvinistic liturgical lineage. It declares that the Lord's Supper is more than a humanistic memorial meal.

Thus when one examines what has been included in the COCU service and what has been omitted from it, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that content does not correspond to intent. Were one to read the service without knowing the theological rationale for it, there would be little reason to suspect that its authors consider the Lord's Supper to be "the unique and distinctive act of Christians that binds them by word and deed in a continual, living relationship with their redeemer and Lord, and through him one with another."⁵

III

Other points of lesser importance may be made with regard to the con-

tent of the service. The realization that "liturgy" means "work of the people" has led to an emphasis on corporate participation in worship, and with good reason. But the passion for participation seems about to overwhelm us in this liturgy. It is as if the designers of the service fear that unless the worshippers say something every eighteen seconds (except during the sermon), they will forget that they are participating. Except to sing hymns, most Protestants have been dumb for generations; are we now to over-react by babbling incessantly?

It is to be said that the responsive prayers in the synaxis are an infinite improvement over the usual "pastoral prayer." But why so much responsive material just before the Communion? And why should the dismissals (i.e., benedictions in usual parlance) be responsive? Can we not allow ourselves to be blessed and then be quietly thankful? The content of the dismissals is also bothersome. The second dismissal is pure exhortation: Instead of blessing the congregation, the minister recapitulates (or concludes) his sermon—albeit in Biblical phraseology. The first dismissal is exhortation plus blessing; but for some strange reason the blessing is placed in brackets, as if it were to be ignored. Only the third dismissal is a true blessing extended by a pastor to his people.

The role of the liturgical year in the liturgy is not entirely clear. It is understandable that the COCU Commission on Worship should not provide us with a lectionary or thesaurus of propers. But it is strange to find no Proper Prefaces, for example. Still, it would be difficult to know what to do with them

⁵ *An Order*, p. 73.

if they were included. The first of the three sections of the great prayer is a sort of prolix preface. Indeed, its length separates the *Sanctus* from the *Sursum Corda* too fully and thus frustrates the climax which has traditionally been achieved in the West through the terse, concise march of *Sursum Corda*, Common Preface, Proper Preface, and *Sanctus*.

The contemporization of traditional texts is a mixed bag. The Lord's Prayer is straightforward and commendable. The *Te Deum laudamus* is more faithful to the original text than is the more familiar English translation. The Collect for Purity, however, is marred by what appears to be a Protestant Freudian slip in the direction of rationalism. The succinct "cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit" has been changed to "cleanse and inform our hearts and minds by the inspiration of your Holy Spirit." There is no apparent reason for the emendation; the Sarum Missal is clear: *Purifica per infusionem sancti spiritus cogitationes cordis nostri*. And the Sarum text is Biblical in spirit (cf., Gen. 6:5; I Chron. 28:9). Why the peculiar translation? Are we no longer willing to admit that thoughts arise from our hearts and must therefore ask that our minds be informed? If there is anything most Protestants do not need more of, it is information. Fie on this translation!

The COCU service is strong in the place it gives to the Scriptures and the number of points at which the Psalter may be employed. The proximity of Scripture and Sermon happily eradicates that Protestant syndrome which puts everything except the benediction

between the lessons and their interpretation. There is adequate provision for both fixed and free prayer—with the specific note that the latter may come from the congregation. There is evidence of a great deal of flexibility within the general structure of the service. The incorporation of the Fraction after (rather than within) the Prayer of Thanksgiving is especially welcome and will smooth the ruffled feathers of those in the Reformed tradition who miss the Decalogue and the Prayer for Illumination. (In a liturgy which is already longer than the usual Sunday service, some deletions must be accepted.)

Any liturgy which is put together by nine denominations will be syncretistic by its very nature. Hence it is not surprising to find elements from the *Book of Common Prayer*, *Book of Common Order*, *Book of Worship*, and the Lord's Day services of The United Church of Christ and The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [Provisional]. It is encouraging that sources beyond the official books of the member denominations have also been influential—particularly the liturgies of the Church of South India and the Taizé community. The COCU service has the quality of a mosaic, but not of a scissors-and-paste job.

IV

Because there are undeniable merits to *An Order of Worship*, the prior problem of the disparity between intent and content becomes more critical. In relation to this incongruity, two questions must be raised. The first is this: "Can we expect anything better from

a uniting church in the light of the necessary compromises by divergent traditions?" I would answer that I think we should expect something better from *this* uniting church. For while COCU embraces a diversity of polities and of certain areas of theological conviction, a peculiar aspect of the proposed merger is that the several component denominations may be related to a common sacramental foundation.

That foundation is Calvin's understanding of the sacrament as the seal of the Spirit in which Christ is present in power. The manner of that presence is a mystery; it is not to be explained by doctrines of transubstantiation or the ubiquity of Christ's body as the Roman Catholics and Lutherans assert. But neither is the Lord's presence to be denied after the manner of the Zwinglians. The sacrament is not a vain and empty sign; to the faithful, the Spirit uses it to declare the reality of what it signifies. The Sacrament is a Visible Word and a means of grace.

The relation of the Presbyterian and United Church bodies to this theological heritage is clear. The matter is more complicated for Episcopalians. But whatever other strains may be found in Anglicanism, Calvin's influence is present and a Calvinist could do worse than to turn to the Thirty-Nine Articles for a sacramental statement. Methodists share in the Calvinian sacramental heritage through its mediation by the Church of England. When John Wesley reduced the Articles to twenty-five in number, and abridged or revised most of what he kept, he did not substantively alter Articles XXV and XXVIII ("Of the Sacraments," and "Of the Lord's Supper"). Further, Charles Wesley's

Eucharistic hymns seem at times to be a poetic version of passages from the *Institutes*.⁶ The relationship of The Christian Church (Disciples) to Calvinistic sacramental theology is more tenuous: Alexander Campbell was in revolt against a strict Calvinistic background and particularly against the severe fencing of the Table which he had experienced. But there are indications that the Disciples today have an affinity to something more than memorialism.

The extent of Calvinistic sacramentalism and the conscious recognition of it is not the same for all of the denominations in COCU. But there is more common ground upon which the participating churches can build than would be the case if the Consultation included Lutherans on the one hand, or Baptists on the other. And although even those denominations which plainly acknowledge their Calvinistic heritage have often strayed far from Calvin's high doctrine of the Eucharist, may not there be occasion for a renewed trust in the power of the Holy Spirit at the Lord's Table as well as at the Consultation table? Instead of lamenting the fact that the memorialists pulled the wool over the eyes of our forebears,

⁶ Methodists who are shocked by any hint of Calvin's theology in Wesleyan thought are urged to compare the hymn "O the Depth of Love Divine" [1966 Methodist Hymnal, No. 332] to Book IV, Chapter XVII of the *Institutes*. Sections 2, 7-10, 18, 24, 31, 32, 36, and 38 are of particular interest. This is not necessarily to suggest that the Wesleys were directly influenced by the *Institutes*; the debt to Calvin's thought may well have been mediated by Church of England theologians. It may be of more than passing interest that the present author is a Methodist, not a Calvinist trying to be imperialistic!

perhaps we should be wary lest we pull the same wool over our own eyes.

But even if we assume a certain common sacramental understanding, a second question must be raised with regard to our critique of the content of the COCU liturgy. That question is frequently stated as follows: "Should not liturgical expression arise out of the faith of the worshipping community; and if so, should we not first educate our people in a better understanding of the Sacrament, and only then change the content to conform to this understanding?" Several points should be made in reply. Certainly liturgical expression should arise from the community of faith. But what is that community? Is it merely the contemporary congregation? Or is it the holy catholic Church of which the creeds speak? If the former, we are in a pitiable state indeed, and liturgy is apt to be little more than a reflection of our own culture and confusion.

Furthermore, how do you best educate Christians with regard to the meaning of the Sacraments? Our rationalistic Protestant bias is again revealed in the suggestion that first we should see to it that our people get their facts straight, and then we can make the liturgical texts conform to this "understanding." It is always helpful to remember that in the early centuries of the Church the process was reversed: Catechumens were baptized (as adults) and given Communion *before* they received any detailed sacramental instruction. This was partially due to the necessity of maintaining security in an era of persecution; but it was more than that. It was also a basic recognition that the Sacraments are an experience, not mere-

ly a concept; and only as we participate in them can we begin to understand what they are about. To try to bring a congregation to a higher doctrine of the Supper by intellectual methods in order that the liturgy may be elevated accordingly may be self-defeating. Let the liturgy set forth a high concept of the Eucharist; then through the experience of the Sacrament the congregation will grow in an understanding which goes far beyond that which can be achieved in catechetical classes.

There is the danger of liturgical didacticism, to be sure. But it is not as threatening as the prospect of a theologically vacuous liturgy. And the COCU service is more apt to fall into the latter error than into the former. It is well and good to suggest that the COCU document taken as a whole (liturgy, commentary, and appended notes taken together) is adequate. But most laymen will not read the rationale; and many pastors will not bother to expound it clearly, in pulpit or out. Hence the liturgical text itself must embody more of the meaning of the Sacrament as set forth in the commentary and appendix.

If there is to be a Church of Christ Uniting, the content of its liturgy should be consonant with the intent of its liturgy. This much we can and should expect. The intent of the Commission on Worship is praiseworthy. Whether the present content is the result of a failure of nerve, or of the fear of theological heaviness, or of the necessity of compromise, or of some other factor, we cannot say. But we can hope for and urge changes in the liturgical text which will make the centrality of the Supper of our Lord more apparent to the worshipper.

Give the liturgically illiterate churchgoer a Eucharistic service which has ambiguous content, which lacks any clear Invitation or Fencing of the Table, any Setting Apart of the Elements or specific blessing of them in the *Epiclesis*, which fails to proclaim clearly the reality of Christ's presence in the Supper. Then tell this man the Sacrament is the normative form of Christian worship. Given his Zwinglian tendencies, his subjective view of worship, his aver-

sion to any service which lasts beyond sixty minutes, and his suspicion that the Eucharist is basically funereal, that man will probably walk away muttering to himself about the virtues of "the old-time religion." The Supper of our Lord should get a fairer chance than that. And the uniting church deserves more, too. There will be problems enough confronting it. The specter of sacramental schizophrenia should not be one of them.

Beyond The Wall

by JOHN R. GRAY

Minister of Dumblane Cathedral, Scotland, John Gray holds graduate degrees in theology from both Yale and Princeton. He served in the Royal Navy 1941-46 and has been sometime lecturer in Practical Theology in Trinity College, Glasgow.

WHEN I first broached the idea of spending a holiday in the German Democratic Republic (*Deutsche Demokratische Republik*), my friends looked at me as if I had lost my reason. When I said that I was taking my wife and three sons, then aged 12, 14 and 16, they were obviously confirmed in their belief that I was crazy. When we actually drove off the ferry from Denmark at Warnemünde into the most Communist of all Communist countries, I began to wonder if they were not right. Indeed, before getting that far, already I had had my suspicions. All arrangements had to be made with Berolina Tours, Ltd. or their Glasgow agents, Sovscot Tours. A senior official of Berolina Tours is held at the moment on a charge under the Official Secrets Act!

It is not possible to obtain a visa for entering East Germany until one presents himself at the border, and one must appear on the date, at the hour and at the place arranged. All food and board must be paid for beforehand. Hotels in the cities or towns of choice are allocated by the State Tourist Bureau. There is a range of hotels only in the big cities. It is compulsory to stay in the hotels allocated on the nights specified, but one is as free as air during the day. A sum of money enough to cover meals is returned at the frontier out of the amount previously paid. Costs are as low as \$7.50 for a medium priced hotel, for bed and full board. Gasoline

is about fifty cents a gallon. Hand-made articles are cheap and good. Some things—coffee, oranges and bananas, good quality paper (for any purposes!), chocolate—are very scarce, but travelers may take a limited quantity of these with them. The roads are fairly good. Parking is easy and free, even in the center of large cities. Traffic is light. More horses than tractors are to be seen in the fields and even on country roads. Everywhere there are Russian soldiers—as many as 250,000, according to one informant. We could believe it from the number we saw, but they do not interfere at all with the local inhabitants or visitors. Fraternization is not encouraged. Pressure, it would appear, is exercised from the top down and always through German fellow-travelers. In contrast with the rest of Western Europe, there is no pornography, no obscenity, and little sign of crime or destitution. There was a general feeling of drabness and run-down-ness, although here and there we saw vast industrial complexes and power stations.

We entered the country at Warnemünde by ferry from Gedser in Denmark and we stayed one night at Stralsund (Hotel Baltika). We went by Greifswald, Neubrandenburg and Neustrelitz to East Berlin where we stayed in the Hotel Sofia. We then went to Dresden (the magnificent new Hotel Bastei), Meissen, Naumburg (Hotel Jacob's Tor), Jena (luncheon in the

first-rate Hotel International), Weimar, Erfurt, Eisenach (Hotel Bahnhof), and so on to Wartha where we entered Western Germany.

Much of medieval Germany remains in the eastern zone, and some of the ancient cathedrals and palaces have been faithfully and beautifully restored. In the Dresden Art Gallery (*Gottfried Semper's Zwinger*) we saw such masterpieces of art as Raphael's Sistine Madonna, Rembrandt's Portrait of Himself with Saskia, Dürer's Portrait of a Young Man, Ruben's The Wild Boar Chase, and many others. At Meissen we saw a display of centuries-old, priceless china and were shown through the famous works. Everywhere we were received with the greatest courtesy and kindness. We had one summons to be at a Police Station at 8 o'clock in the morning, but the police seemed merely to want to meet visitors so unusual. In one town we were followed by a man, but he seemed to grow weary of it by and by. He, too, may have been simply a curious idler. Our car, an old Rover 95—very British—attracted a crowd of children wherever we stopped. Our German is poor, but we were not once taken advantage of, so far as we could judge. No one attempted to extort tips from us. And when I wrote after leaving, complaining about the standards of comfort in two of the hotels, I had a most courteous letter, admitting that the complaint was justified and returning over fifteen dollars which the Tourist Bureau felt had been overcharged.

One of the most moving experiences was in East Berlin where a young German girl who was showing us round wept when we came to the Wall at Checkpoint Charlie. The bunker where

Hitler perished could be seen near-by. We saw Buchenwald also, with a great basket of human hair, with the horrible lamp-shade made of human skin and its fearful record of 50,000 men, women and children done to death. The air of evil which hangs almost visibly about the place was felt by all of us. In Buchenwald, curiously, we met three German nuns in habit, the only occasion when we saw people in clerical dress. We saw no British or American cars anywhere in East Germany, but many from Bulgaria, Russia, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. In some cases people said they had met no English-speaking people for years. This is a pity, for there is a real eagerness to welcome strangers. One lady who spoke to us in Dresden was a Professor of English from Georgia—Stalin's home State. Her accent was perfect, but we were the first native English-speakers she had ever spoken to. She had learned the language entirely from gramophone records. We sent her a Dictionary and a New Testament for a Christmas present, but have not yet had an acknowledgment. We hope the gifts did not land her in hot water.

What of Church life? It was worth the trip to experience the warmth of Christian hospitality and also to be made more fully aware of the difference between those who profess Christ and those who do not. As soon as we entered any of the Christian homes, hostels or seminaries to which we were invited, we were struck with the light-hearted happiness and good humor we found as contrasted with the grim seriousness outside. Even the decoration and curtains seemed to be gayer. Theological faculties are maintained in four

Universities, and there are seminaries and deaconess hostels controlled and paid for by the Church. There is a plentiful supply of splendid candidates for the ministry. The bishops live in a degree of comfort comparable with that of bishops anywhere. The pastors live about the level of an artisan. Congregations are small and dwindling. I heard of no new church buildings except in the diocese of Bishop Mitzenheim who is friendly with Herr Ulbricht and sympathetic with the régime. Elsewhere the churches are huge, poorly heated, in not very good order and in the wrong places. I preached only once, partly in German and partly in English, in the Church of St. Othmar in the little Cathedral and University town of Naumburg-Saale. There were some sixty people in the church, including a number of students I had met the night before and some people who had come to see two babies baptized. I was not warned to be careful about what I said, and I wasn't. Nothing happened. We had long conversations with Bishop Krummacker, the Presiding Bishop of the East German Church, and with Bishop Mitzenheim of Eisenach, with a number of University and Seminary professors and with some pastors. There is no active persecution of the Church. No ministers are in prison. They may preach freely, although obviously they must be guarded in their references to the State. There are no Chaplains in the Forces, in prisons, hospitals or schools. Religious instruction can be given only to those who desire it and calls may be made only on the homes of those who claim to be Christian. Many privileges in the way of higher education, holidays and travel

abroad are reserved for party members, or at least for those who are sympathetic with the régime. In the new industrial suburbs there appear to be no church buildings. There is one religious service each Sunday on the radio (mostly Lutheran), but occasionally Roman Catholic or Reformed. The government being explicitly atheist, its policy appears to be to discourage religion by every means short of persecution. For example, in one town I saw a line-up for a children's *matinée*, the hour of which is chosen to coincide with Sunday School. Most young people have taken the "Youth Oath," a somewhat ambiguous promise of allegiance to the State and to International Peace. None of the Christians we met saw it as their duty actively to oppose the State. It is obviously possible to accept it as passing good without accepting its atheism. Most seem to have done this. The more intellectual bide their time and hope for a change. The State on the other hand hopes that religion will be recognized as a decaying superstition for the elderly which will in due course fade away.

The result of all this was described by one of the bishops. Cupping a hand, he blew into it and said, "The chaff is all blown away. The numbers in the Church are shrinking—happily." Certainly a merely conventional religion will not long survive under such conditions. The quality of the committed Christians we met was such, however, that we could not help believing that the Church will begin to grow, just as it shrinks when it becomes too large and easy and all-embracing. It must, however, be exhausting to maintain any glow of faith in an atmosphere so ut-

terly and consistently hostile to it. It might be a relief for East German Christians to visit churches which are basking in the sunshine of a reasonable prosperity with the support of an approving State. It would be exhilarating certainly for easy-going Christians from the affluent West to be confronted with

those for whom faith is very costly and whose Christianity is therefore a leaner and more athletic thing than their own. It is, therefore, to be hoped that contact between East and West will become easier and that full advantage will be taken of any opportunities for reciprocal visits.

The New English Bible, 1970

by BRUCE M. METZGER

AFTER more than twenty years of work, there has now come from the Oxford and the Cambridge University Presses the completed translation of the Scriptures, with the Apocrypha, known as *The New English Bible*.¹

The story of the initial proposal that ways and means be explored for preparing a modern speech version of the Bible (a proposal introduced into the Presbytery of Stirling and Dunblane in 1946 by the Rev. George S. Hendry, now Charles Hodge Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton Seminary), as well as the subsequent formation of committees of Biblical scholars representing various Protestant Churches in Britain, was recounted in the BULLETIN of September 1961 on the

A member of Princeton's faculty since 1940, Professor Metzger is an alumnus of the Seminary and holds the Ph.D. degree from the University. As translator, textual critic, and bibliographer, he occupies a place of first rank among New Testament scholars. He is a member of the Standard Bible Committee of the National Council of Churches, has served as secretary of the committee of translators of the RSV Apocrypha, and is on the continuing New Testament committee which reviews periodically suggestions for alteration submitted to the RSV office at Yale Divinity School.

occasion of the publication of the New Testament in the new version, and need not be repeated here. The remarkable number of sales of the NEB New Testament immediately after its publication testified to its popularity as a modern-speech version (outdistanced now, however, by the still more widespread distribution of the American Bible Society's *Good News for Modern Man*, *Today's English Version of the New Testament*, 1966).

It is natural that the recent publication (March 16, 1970) of the Old Testament and of the Apocrypha of the New English Bible has been hailed as a landmark in the history of Bible translating. Planned and directed by a Joint Committee composed of representatives of nine Protestant churches of the British Isles, the work of translation was accomplished by three panels of distinguished scholars. At the outset of the work, the convener of the Old Testament panel was Dr. T. H. Robinson, a representative of the Baptist Union and an Old Testament specialist. In 1957 Professor G. R. (now Sir Godfrey) Driver succeeded Dr. Robinson, and in 1965, when the work on the Old Testament was approaching completion, Sir

¹ There are two editions of *The New English Bible*: the Standard Edition in one volume, the Old and New Testaments, \$8.95, with the Apocrypha, \$9.95; the Library Edition in three volumes, The Old Testament, \$8.95; The Apocrypha, \$4.95; The New Testament (second edition), \$5.95. The New Testament (second edition) is also available in paperback at \$1.75. All are published by the Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Avenue, N.Y., 10016, and the Cambridge University Press, 32 East 57th Street, N.Y., 10022.

Godfrey was appointed Joint Director with Dr. C. H. Dodd, who also served as convener of the New Testament panel. The convener of the panel on the Apocrypha was W. D. McHardy, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, who was also a member of the Old Testament panel and who was appointed Deputy Director of the NEB in December, 1968. (Readers of the BULLETIN may be interested to know that Professor McHardy, an ordained minister of the Church of Scotland, is the first non-Anglican to become Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford since the foundation of that professorship many centuries ago.) There has also been a Panel of Literary Advisers, whose convener was Dr. A. T. P. Williams. The duty of this panel was to help the translators find the best way of expressing the meaning of the text in contemporary English.

The Old Testament

The translator of the Old Testament faces notorious difficulties involving not only the meaning of certain rare Hebrew words, but also what to do with passages which scholars have considered to be disarranged in their present sequence. As was true of the Revised Standard Version, here and there the NEB resorts to conjecture on the basis of the Greek Septuagint and other ancient versions in order to determine what the original Hebrew text must have been. A typical example is the introduction in Gen. 4:8 of the words of Cain to his brother Abel, "Let us go into the open country," where the Hebrew obviously has suffered in transmission. Usually, the NEB indicates in a footnote when the translators have de-

parted from the Hebrew, though no such note appears at Gen. 4:8.

Much more radical departures from the Massoretic text involve the re-arrangement of the sequence of the text. Though following basically R. Kittel's *Biblica Hebraica* (3rd edition, 1937), the Old Testament panel felt obliged here and there to depart from the traditional text. For example, in the book of Isaiah verses 24 and 25 of chapter 5 now stand after 10:4; verses 8-10 of chapter 27 are re-arranged to stand in the order 9, 10a, 8, 10b; verses 21-22 of chapter 38 now stand between verses 6 and 7; 41:6-7 follow 40:20; and 52:14b is moved to conclude 53:2.

Other departures from the Massoretic text include the introduction of identifying tags into the margin of the Song of Songs indicating successive speakers (namely, the Bride, the Bridegroom, and the Companions). This information, derived from two manuscripts of the Septuagint, obviously is of great help to the reader in understanding the text. Another departure from the traditional Hebrew text, however, can scarcely be approved. The titles of the Psalms, consisting partly of musical instructions and partly of historical notices (for example, Psalm 51 is traditionally associated with David's adultery), have simply been omitted. Admittedly, the meaning of many of the musical instructions is exceedingly difficult to ascertain, but this is no reason to absolve the translators from doing the best they could in providing a rendering of the words.

It may be mentioned that the Library Edition of the Old Testament has a greater number of footnotes than does the so-called Standard Edition. The ex-

tra categories of notes in the former (a) draw attention to the literal meaning of the Hebrew where the English idiom markedly differs, and (b) inform the reader where the reading of other Hebrew manuscripts, or of one or other of the versions, has been followed either in whole or in part.

Before giving several typical passages as samples of the work of the Old Testament panel, it will be appropriate to mention several details of translation in which readers will probably be particularly interested. In the case of the divine name, written with the consonants YHWH, the panel has wisely decided not to use the un-English "Yahweh" (which the Jerusalem Bible employs), but to follow ancient translators in substituting "LORD" and "God," printed in capital letters, for the Hebrew name. In the case of the Hebrew word *sh'ôl*, sometimes the panel transliterates (as Ps. 139:8, "If I make my bed in Sheol"), and sometimes it translates (as Gen. 37:35, "I will go to my grave mourning for my son").

In Ecclesiastes the Preacher ("Qoheleth") becomes "the Speaker." In Is. 7:14 the Hebrew word '*almâh*, as in the RSV, is translated "young woman," and the tense of the verb is taken as referring to a contemporary sign ("A young woman is with child, and she will bear a son, and will call him Immanuel").

A striking departure from the traditional text is the rendering of S. of Songs 1:7 (italicized here):

"Tell me, my true love,
where you mind your flocks,
where you rest them at midday,
that I may not be left picking lice
as I sit among your companions'
herds."

The general tone of the Old Testament rendering will be sensed from the following three samples, chosen from each of the three main divisions of the Hebrew canon.

"In the beginning of creation, when God made heaven and earth, the earth was without form and void, with darkness over the face of the abyss, and a mighty wind that swept over the surface of the waters. God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light; and God saw that the light was good, and he separated light from darkness. He called the light day, and the darkness night. So evening came, and morning came, the first day.

"God said, 'Let there be a vault between the waters, to separate water from water.' So God made the vault, and separated the water under the vault from the water above it, and so it was; and God called the vault heaven. Evening came, and morning came, a second day."

—Gen. 1:1-8.

"Comfort, comfort my people;
—it is the voice of your God;
speak tenderly to Jerusalem
and tell her this,
that she has fulfilled her term of
bondage,
that her penalty is paid;
she has received at the LORD's
hand
double measure for all her sins.

"There is a voice that cries:
Prepare a road for the Lord through
the wilderness,
clear a highway across the desert for
our God.
Every valley shall be lifted up,

every mountain and hill brought
down;
rugged places shall be made smooth
and mountain-ranges become a
plain.

Thus shall the glory of the Lord
be revealed,
and all mankind together shall
see it;
for the LORD himself has spoken."

—Is. 40:1-5.

"The LORD is my shepherd; I shall
want nothing.

He makes me lie down in
green pastures,
and leads me beside the waters
of peace;

he renews life within me,
and for his name's sake guides
me in the right path.

Even though I walk through a
valley dark as death

I fear no evil, for thou art
with me,

thy staff and thy crook are my
comfort.

"Thou spreadest a table for me
in the sight of my enemies;
thou hast richly bathed my head
with oil,

and my cup runs over.

Goodness and love unfailing,
these will follow me

all the days of my life,
and I shall dwell in the house
of the LORD

my whole life long."

—Ps. 23.

The Apocrypha

The panel responsible for translating
the fifteen books, or parts of books, of
the Old Testament Apocrypha chose to

use Swete's edition of the Septuagint
(rather than Rahlfs' more recent critical
edition) and R. L. Bensly's edition
of *The Fourth Book of Ezra*. In the
case of the additions to Esther, the
panel decided to translate the entire
Greek text of Esther, identifying the
portions that are supplementary to the
Hebrew text.

As was done for the translation of I
and II Maccabees in the RSV, the NEB
provides footnotes supplying dates B.C.
for dates of events mentioned in the
text. In general one observes that the
NEB is more parsimonious than the
RSV in supplying notes giving alterna-
tive renderings and alternative read-
ings. In II Esdras the variant readings
presented by the several Oriental ver-
sions (Syriac, Armenian, Georgian,
Ethiopic, and two forms of Arabic) are
not identified (as they are in the RSV
footnotes), but are listed anonymously
as "Vss"—an abbreviation (not ex-
plained for the reader) that stands for
"Versions."

The titles of the canonical books of
the Old Testament are retained un-
changed (though "Song of Songs" is
an obvious Hebraism); in the Apoc-
rypha, however, the translators allowed
themselves greater liberties, and the tra-
ditional title "Bel and the Dragon" has
become "Daniel, Bel, and the Snake."

As a specimen of the kind of inter-
pretative translation characteristic of the
NEB, the rendering of Ecclesiasticus
36:21ff. may be compared with the more
literal rendering of the RSV (the latter
is given first):

"A woman will accept any man,
but one daughter is better
than another.

A woman's beauty gladdens the
countenance,
and surpasses every human desire.
If kindness and humility mark
her speech,
her husband is not like other
men."

The more paraphrastic rendering of the NEB is as follows:

"A woman will take any man for
husband,
but a man may prefer one girl
to another.
A woman's beauty makes a
man happy,
and there is nothing he desires more.
If she has a kind and gentle tongue,
then her husband is luckier than
most men."

In view of the freedom that the translators allowed themselves, it is appropriate to quote here the words of the principal reviewer of the first edition of the NEB New Testament in *The* (London) *Times Literary Supplement* (24 March, 1961, p. 178), who concluded his review with the comment: "If one's sole concern is with what the New Testament writers mean, it [the new version] is excellent. It is otherwise if one wants to find out what the documents actually say."

The New Testament

When the RSV Old Testament was finished and published in 1952, the RSV New Testament, originally published in 1946, was re-issued with a few changes (about eighty). In a similar way, now that the complete NEB has been published, the translation of the New Testament has been given a care-

ful revision, in which the panel has taken account of numerous criticisms and suggestions. No disclosure is made of the number of the changes introduced into the second edition, but in the explanatory pamphlet issued by the Oxford and the Cambridge University Presses, entitled *The Story of the New English Bible*, the comment is made that "in their review they [the translators] found good reason for making changes in rather more places than they had expected" (p. 12). Obviously, the number was great enough to warrant calling the resulting revision a "second edition."¹ At the same time, the anonymous author of the pamphlet thinks it appropriate to assure the reader that "none of the changes was really extensive," and after citing a number of such changes (such as "paralyzed man" for the previous "paralytic," and "Gentile" for the previous "Greek"), he declares with dubious logic: "It is a tribute to the original work of the translators that the essential character of the NEB New Testament remains unchanged in this Second Edition."

Among the alterations observed by the present writer, the following may be singled out for special comment. First, corrections of outright errors will be mentioned. The erroneous statements concerning textual evidence cited in the footnotes to Matt. 9:33 and to I Pet. 3:18 have been corrected. The translation of Gal. 4:30, "the free woman's sons," has been corrected to "the free woman's son." The 1961 rendering of Rev. 3:17, "I have everything I want in the world," has now been brought into conformity with the original by drop-

¹ A comparison of the two editions reveals nearly four hundred alterations.

ping the words "in the world," for which there had been no justification in the Greek.

At the close of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:13), the reader is advised in a new footnote that the Greek which is translated in the text, "the evil one," may also be rendered "from evil." In both the Matthean and Lucan forms of the Lord's Prayer, no longer does each line begin with a capital letter, as in the 1961 edition, but only the initial word of each new sentence.

Other alterations have been introduced for a variety of reasons. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus' advice, "Do not feed your pearls to pigs" (Matt. 7:6), now more appropriately reads, "Do not throw your pearls to the pigs." Jesus' promise to Peter concerning the church, "The forces of death shall never overpower it," now reads, "The powers of death shall never conquer it" (Matt. 16:18). When the blind men outside Jericho shouted to Jesus, in the 1961 rendering, the bystanders "rounded on them"; in the 1970 rendering they "told them sharply to be quiet" (Matt. 20:31).

These examples will illustrate the kinds of alterations introduced into the second edition of the New Testament. Perhaps some will think that the revision was too cautious, and that occasional Britishisms or *recherché* expressions might well have been removed. Thus, the reader of the NEB still learns that Stephen's speech "touched them [those who heard] on the raw" (Acts 7:54), and Paul still advises the Corinthians to "have nothing to do with loose livers" (I Cor. 5:9). In Mark 4:21 the lamp is still put "under the meal-

tub," and in 6:3 we are still told that the congregation that heard Jesus teach in the synagogue "fell foul of him." A particularly notable example of the use of unusual and non-colloquial English is the rendering of Rev. 18:16, where the merchants and traders lament the fall of Babylon in the stilted language, "Alas, alas for the great city . . . bedizened with gold and jewels and pearls!"—whereas the so-called archaic King James Version uses the perfectly good word "decked."

Conclusion

Some readers, acquainted with the extent to which J. B. Phillips and the American Bible Society's *Today's English Version* go in the direction of paraphrase and restructuring of sentences, will be disappointed that the New English Bible is not more radical in its departure from previous versions. On the other hand, readers who are accustomed to the phraseology of the King James Version, taken over in part by the Revised Standard Version, may feel that the new version just does not sound like the Word of God. For modern pagans who have no knowledge of the Scriptures at all, this new rendering will no doubt be more intelligible and will speak more directly to their understanding than versions in more archaic English. Many church members, whether in Britain or America, will probably find that this new translation, freer and more paraphrastic than other standard versions, may be profitably used with those versions that stand in the classic tradition.

Book Reviews

My Travel Diary: 1936, by Paul Tillich. Harper & Row, New York, Evans-ton, and London, 1970. Pp. 192. \$5.95.

Paul Tillich's enforced emigration from Nazi Germany in 1933 gave America one of its most profound and influential theologians of the past generation. Since his death in 1965 several volumes of his lectures have been published, and now the only existing diary Tillich left has been printed, with an introduction by Dean Jerald C. Brauer of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago and with drawings interpretative of the spirit of the diary by Alfonso Ossorio.

My Travel Diary extends from April 11 to September 16, 1936, consists of reports sent back to his wife in New York, and details the author's experiences on his first return to Europe after his exile. His first stop was England, where his host was Joseph Oldham, busy with preparations for the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences to be held the following year. Crossing the Atlantic, Tillich has been engaged in preparing a lecture on the theme, "The Kingdom of God and History," one of the conference subjects. After his stay in England he proceeded to the Continent, visiting friends, many of them also refugees, in the Netherlands, France, Switzerland, and Italy.

While diaries are to be read and not reviewed, some comments are in order, if only to stimulate others to read these pages. The editor correctly observes that those looking for new materials or new insights into Tillich's theology will be disappointed. But there are marvelous glimpses of Tillich the man, the lover of nature and of art, into the catholicity of his interests and of his friendships, the way he learned, the extent of his identification with his new home in America, and his fascination with Germany standing on the brink of the destructive fury that would unleash World War II. No reader of his theology will want to miss this intimate portrait of the life and life-style of Paul Tillich.

JAMES I. MCCORD

Theology and Meaning: A Critique of Metatheological Scepticism, by Raeburne S. Heimbeck. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, Calif., 1969. Pp. 276. \$7.50.

This is a wordy, tedious book which was based apparently on a doctoral dissertation completed in 1965. The author has tried to up-date the work a bit, but it goes over very familiar and frequently treated material and problems in the area known in analytic philosophic circles as "the logic of religious language."

Although it is basically sound in its assessment of the material in this area, it does not make any addition to the subject, nor is it a readable presentation of the material. It attempts to launch a new idea in criticism of the well-known challenge to religious beliefs by logical positivism and kindred spirits by distinguishing between criteria and evidence (an idea the author seems to have got from his former teacher, Professor G. E. Hughes of New Zealand). But its alleged usefulness in rebutting this challenge is unconvincing.

The major claim of the book—that the system of classical theism may properly be said to rest on an empirical basis (p. 174)—is either trivial or false. That a claim or system has consequences which are in principle open to empirical confirmation or refutation is hardly enough to make it a system that rests on empirical matters. For this, checkability is one of checkability in principle, not in practice. Very little of any religion is open in practice to very much empirical checking, as a superficial comparison with the natural and social sciences would make obvious. (Why, for example, do physicists need vast amounts of equipment for experiments, and social scientist grants for their surveys, whereas religion departments and theological seminaries need only libraries?).

DIOGENES ALLEN

Sense and Nonsense in Religion: An Essay on the Language and Phenomenology of Religion, by Sten H. Stenson. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1969. Pp. 255. \$5.95.

This book, which won the Abingdon Award for 1968, has some merit. Its tone is pleasant and engaging; it is earnest, without heaviness; and although it has more preachy bits than is usual for philosophical writing today, it is good preaching. All in all, it may help create in one a more positive attitude toward religion. But as a contribution to the philosophy of religion, it leaves much to be desired. Its one novel idea, though interesting, is too fragile to be able to stand up to the severe pounding any defense of religion must be prepared to endure. The novelty of the book is the alleged likeness of religion to humor. Puns and witticisms are said to be based largely on leading a person in one direction and then abruptly shifting that direction. (One of the author's favorite examples is of the drunk who, after he had accidentally staggered off a pier into a lake, said: "I must climb out of these wet clothes into a dry martini!") Religious language, the author claims, has the same feature: "... various lines of thought are suddenly drawn at cross purposes, and we are thrown from syntax to syntax without being able to complete a thought along any one line" (p. 113). If we try to reduce religious language to straight-forward language, we are led into logical contradiction (*pace* the problem of evil). On the other hand, to seek to smooth out its contradictory character is analogous to taking the wrinkles out of our language which permit us to make a joke.

We are then unable to reduce talk of God to straight-forward speech. The underlying reason for this is that God is transcendent; he escapes all our categories of thought. Religious language is incurably paradoxical. To seek to remove its paradoxical character is to neglect the existential awareness out of which it grows; and it is to fail to recognize that paradoxical language is capable of calling attention to important features of life, just as a good joke has a point to it precisely because of the cross-purposes of its syntax.

This is indeed a fresh way to express the

inevitable inadequacy of language which refers to a transcendent God, and it is very important to be forcibly reminded of it once again. But the author seems to think that the paradoxical nature of religious language is *by itself* sufficient to deal with the problem of evil, the significance of historical events for a religion, and the criticisms of reason and science.

Consider, for example, the upshot of his long discussion of the problem of evil. He confesses that there is a contradiction between the existence of a Christian God and evil. Yet he says in effect: What else should we expect of human concepts? A contradiction is no reason to abandon God, especially as evil is such a terrible existential problem. This sort of reasoning is like trying to play a game with one who constantly changes the rules. Contradictions are a very serious business.

He dismisses in passing the significance of the historicity of such events as the crucifixion and resurrection on the basis of some vague existential notion that the myth of death and re-birth is validated within one's personal experience. ("The Christian whose faith would be shaken by the thought that the empty tomb might not have shown up as such in a photograph is badly confused" [p. 154]). I've never thought of trying to use a camera, but Paul tells us that if Christ did not rise from the dead (and he meant Christ), then we are still in our sins and the most wretched of men.

He tells us (p. 142) that we are not to abandon reason nor give up science, but to supplement them with myth (his conception of religion). But on his own terms, you do not *supplement* one item with another, when on your own showing one of those items is incommensurate with the others. To supplement is to add commensurate items. You cannot avoid rational criticism by pleading that in religion we have paradoxical material, and then with no more ado, just add it onto material which is rationally based. Faith and reason just cannot be put together in this slap-dash fashion.

All in all, then, as a tour de force, it is not a bad book. But too much written on religion for too long has been of this nature.

DIODENES ALLEN

Apology for Wonder, by Sam Keen. Harper & Row, New York, N.Y., 1969. Pp. 218. \$5.95.

The environmental crisis makes this a timely book, even though it is not about this problem. For the experts tell us that the root of this problem is our utilitarian approach to persons and things, and this book is concerned with our inability to perceive any intrinsic mystery and worth anywhere, and hence our lack of reverence for anything. But even though timely, useful, and centered on the vital importance of wonder and awe (a view which I deeply endorse), it is nonetheless a seriously defective piece of work. It is riddled with loose thinking, inadequate analyses, and plain old mistakes, all of which are typical of most American theological work today.

To begin with, he claims to give a phenomenological analysis of wonder (to be doing phenomenology is an increasingly favorite claim among theologians today). But it is no more than a summary statement, sifted from books and laced with a few personal experiences, of the elements involved in wonder. It is not a phenomenological description of a condition of *consciousness*. Nowadays phenomenology in the hands of theologians is just a fancy way of saying "description." He does not give any kind of a description of wonder, much less a phenomenological one. For example, he usually refers to wonder as an attitude. But on other occasions it is treated as a mood; and on still at least one other occasion, it is conceived to be a sudden shattering experience (p. 28). Now an attitude is a disposition, often permanent and able to exist simultaneously with other attitudes without interference. A mood, however, is pervasive and dominant, coloring everything in the field of attention, and it is of short duration. A sudden shattering experience is neither an attitude (although an attitude can be conducive or non-conducive to the occurrence of an experience), nor a mood. The author would have been better advised to have actually employed Wittgenstein (his notion of a "family-resemblance" in an analysis of wonder might have allowed such diversity) instead of using him in a name-dropping fashion (p. 22).

Granted that there is wonder, so what? Consider, for example, Michael Foster's treatment of wonder (*Mystery and Philosophy*, 1957). He not only presents wonder in a vastly superior fashion, but shows in considerable detail and with imagination the conflict between it and contemporary analytic philosophy. Keen can only throw out a few caustic and uninformed remarks about this movement in philosophy. Foster also shows the relevance of wonder to the Christian conception of revelation, and the discontinuity, not only the continuity, between mystery and wonder in Christianity and the pagan world.

Such detailed analyses and applications are not found in Keen. Instead we are promised an apology for wonder, a justification for it, in the sense that its presence is necessary for an authentic humanness. This turns out to be a re-play of Nietzsche's Dionysian and Apollonian types, plus Reinhold Niebuhr's strategy in *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (which uses analogous types: the Romantic and the Rational). Like Niebuhr, emphasis on either type is destructive; what we need is both together in balance. This is authentic life: both structure and openness. Wonder is among the fruits of openness, and hence we need it to be authentic.

We have here once again the elevation into the pantheon of the divinities the "with-it" values of a particular time and class, *uninformed* by the past (the past is stripped; it is not treated as a reality over-against us, that judges our time as well as being judged by our time). The glorious things are: "openness, availability, epistemological humility in the face of the mystery of being, and the ability to admire and be grateful" (p. 212). All very good things indeed. But if you've got them, is that all that really matters? In ancient times, Homer conceived of a life as a story of *deeds*; what one did is what mattered. Augustine in his *Confessions* wrote of life as though it were a story of *experiences* one had had. Here life is conceived of as the having of *attitudes*. It is as truncated a view of life as the others. Actually, what we are and amount to empirically is very elusive, and it is constantly open to re-evaluation, just like a stock-market share. If we are anything else,

this depends solely on God. This book's account of what it is to be in relation to God, summed up in the above attitudes, hardly does justice to the reports of those whom all would agree were godly men.

There is no appreciation of the serious intellectual pressure which rids the mind and heart of gods and wonder in the history of western science and philosophy. There is not a hint of the glory of that intellectual pressure. There is not the slightest trace of the beauty, honesty and power of thought which enabled one to conceive of the conservation of energy, for example. The grounds for a philosophical claim, such as, for example, "a question that cannot be answered in principle is no question" (p. 32), is not even mentioned. There is instead merely a high-handed dismissal: "Fortunately, however, philosophers cannot legislate what questions may and may not be asked, and we may be relatively certain that human beings will continue not only to be curious about *how* things are but to wonder *why* they are" (p. 32). The claim was not a piece of legislation, but the conclusion to a reasoned analysis; to meet it and to weigh its merits means consideration of its evidence. That people will do what they do regardless of philosophers is not in the least grounds for saying they should so act or that they rightly so act.

Finally, there are wild generalizations and mistakes. Hegel, despite the myth in religion departments and first year philosophy courses, was not a determinist (p. 168), and hence he cannot be said to be a classic case of the closed Apollonian personality type. The term "necessity" in Hegel is not used in a determinist sense, but is used in contrast to "accidental" (not to be confused with contingent) or in contrast to "no reason can be given for it." The analysis of primal man, especially of his feelings and attitudes, not to mention the use of the now exploded concept of "manna," could well stand reference to *Theories of Primitive Religion* by Evans-Pritchard. No one knows or can know how primal man felt. It is hard enough to know how your neighbor feels, much less the very earliest men who left little more than their bones. There is, moreover, no warrant whatsoever to consider historical peoples or today's backward peoples as like primal men. The treat-

ment of the relation of Greek philosophy to Greek religion is rubbish (p. 72). He treats only civic religion and makes no mention of the mystery religions. The 18th century was not anti-God (p. 119); the *philosophes* were opposed to supernatural revelation and especially Christian revelation and the Church. The atheist was rare, even among the *philosophes*.

We have then a typical American contemporary work in theology. It is high-class preaching, poor soul-philosophy, and low-class academic work.

DIOGENES ALLEN

The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretation of Scripture, by John Bowker. Cambridge University Press, New York, N.Y., 1969. Pp. xxii + 379. \$12.50.

The author of this book, who is fellow of Corpus Christi College and lecturer in Divinity in the University of Cambridge, has written an interesting compendium of the Jewish methods of interpreting Scripture. The work consists of two main divisions. In the first part, which is called "Introduction: the Background of the Targums," he has four chapters in which he discusses translation and interpretation, pre-Rabbinic, non-Rabbinic, and classical Rabbinic literature. He notes that already in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah Hebrew was no longer adequately understood (cf. Neh. 8:1-8; 13:23-24), and in this connection mentions that some later books of the Old Testament are partly written in Aramaic. The knowledge of Hebrew was undermined not only by the rapid spread of Aramaic, but also by the fact that both in the Diaspora and in Palestine many Jews knew only Greek, since they had to adapt themselves to the environment in which they lived. Mr. Bowker refers to the need of translation so that both Jews and non-Jews could understand the Hebrew Scriptures. Moreover he observes that the emphasis in translation was on understanding the meaning of Scripture and that from the very beginning the purpose was to unfold the sense of the text without being scrupulously literal.

He rightly points out that even the Septuagint was willing to make alterations to avoid difficulties and in the interest of doctrine.

The author notes that there was diversity in Judaism in Palestine in the time of Jesus and that communities outside the homeland were constructing their own interpretations of Judaism, even though they all were building upon the same revelation. The origin of the synagogue is obscure, but Bowker believes that in Judea it was closely connected with the *ma'amadoth*, which were divisions of the people throughout Judea intended to correspond to the twenty-four courses of priests in the Temple. In this way all the people were involved in the services and sacrifices of the Temple, even though they could not be present in Jerusalem. The writer thinks that from these assemblies the synagogues in Palestine were developed and that the origin of the synagogue from its earliest days was closely connected with the reading of Torah.

The Targums began with an oral free translation of the Hebrew text into Aramaic, and eventually these renderings became traditional and were reduced to writing. In their method of interpretation Bowker places them half-way between the Septuagint and those works whose purpose was to reproduce the Biblical narrative in their own words, often for their own particular object. In considering texts and manuscripts of the Targums the author devotes almost five pages to the manuscript Neofiti I and also discusses the Fragmentary Targum, the Cairo Geniza fragments, and the two well-known Targums: the Targum Onqelos and Pseudo-Jonathan (originally called the Palestinian or Jerusalem Targum). The latter is late in its final form, but since it rests on a tradition going back to pre-Christian times and accordingly contains very early material, it is an important document. In Chapter 4, under classical Rabbinic literature, the author discusses halakah and haggadah, Midrash, Tosefta, and the Talmuds.

In the second part of the volume (pp. 94-297) is found a translation of selected chapters of Genesis from the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum; the purpose of these renderings is to give substantial illustration of the method and material of the Targum. In this section readers who do not know either Hebrew or

Aramaic can obtain a good idea of the manner of Jewish interpretation. Naturally the best approach to this is to know both languages and secure the information firsthand, but for many this is not possible. The translation is followed by seven appendices, a bibliography (pp. 326-348); indexes of Biblical references, the Targums, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Christian and Hellenistic writers, Rabbinic works; lists of Greek and Semitic words, names of places, Rabbis, modern authors, and finally a general subject index. The book contains much material that is not found in Bible dictionaries and serves as a useful book of reference for ministers and Biblical students.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

The Old Testament: An Introduction to its Literary, Historical, and Religious Traditions, by H. Keith Beebe. Dickenson Publishing Co. Inc., Belmont, Calif., 1970. Pp. 505. \$8.95.

Professor Beebe, a graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary and Chairman of the Department of Religious Studies at Occidental College, has written a basic introductory textbook on the Old Testament which the Bible student will find useful, stimulating and up-to-date in every area of biblical scholarship. Because of the author's special interest in the Old Testament as literature and its influence on modern literary figures (chap. 1), he guides the reader to an understanding of the Old Testament by following the chronological steps of its literary growth from the earliest Hebrew poetry (chap. 3) to the exceedingly varied literary forms at the end of the Old Testament age—wisdom, apocalyptic and the literature from Qumran. After discussing the literature in each period of the Old Testament the author delineates the historical conditions related to the literature, as well as the religious traditions which it preserves.

Special attention is paid throughout the volume to the important archaeological discoveries which have thrown so much light on various aspects of the Old Testament. Photographs, line drawings and maps give

visual emphasis to the text, and an 18-page bibliography of scholarly books in English is a valuable guide for further study of Old Testament problems.

Because of the author's method described above, the reviewer found the discussion of Israel's earlier literature, history and religion rather confusing. The arrangement of the material found in chapters 4 to 8 is especially difficult to understand. For instance, the role of the ark is discussed in connection with David's reign on p. 83, and then again in connection with Moses and the Sinai experience on p. 157. On p. 293 several theories regarding the early origin of the synagogue are presented, and on p. 346 the exilic origin of the synagogue is taken for granted. Actually there is not the slightest evidence for the existence of the synagogue before the first century A.D. Certainly Psalm 74:8 can hardly be adduced as proof for the existence of synagogues in Palestine for several reasons which cannot be discussed here.

Some specific corrections may be added here: "transcendence" for "transcendancy" (p. 396), and "psalmody" for "psalmody" (p. 347); Gen. 31:47 should be added to footnote 8, p. 8; is the plate on p. 454 cave 1 at Qumran?; all footnotes with reference to *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* should be checked and brought into line—p. 10, n. 11; 24, n. 8; and 76, n. 16 compared with 114, n. 4, etc.; also those notes referring to *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*—p. 170, n. 1 and 370, n. 11 compared with 142, n. 7, etc.; in footnote 15, p. 48, does "Seir" mean "south" in Hebrew?

CHARLES T. FRITSCH

The Old Testament and Jesus Christ, by Claus Westermann (trans. by Omar Kaste). Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn., 1969. Pp. 80. \$2.25.

The topic of this book, first published in German in 1968, is the relationship of the New Testament and Jesus to the Old Testament. Westermann's major studies in a number of areas (e.g., Genesis, prophets, psalms) significantly inform his approach to this topic and give added importance to what he has to say. Besides providing stimulation to the

scholar, this book should be greatly appreciated by the layman for whom it is primarily intended (not a single footnote to scare him away). The presentation is lucid and generally free of technical language or long theoretical discussions of the problems of hermeneutics. Among the options rejected are prediction, "fuller sense," proof texts (based on a no longer valid presupposition of the absolute unity of the Old Testament), and more rigid forms of typology. Even the promise-fulfillment pattern to which Westermann is favorably disposed he refuses to make into the single key. The diversity of materials in the Old Testament has produced a diversity of relationships between the testaments. Many connections are intrinsically based in a similar response to a similar situation (e.g., confession as the basic response to an act of God). Yet that the responses are similar is due to the common historical context including elements of both continuity and discontinuity.

Westermann finds the closest link between the New Testament portrayal of Jesus and the Old Testament to be the figure of the suffering servant. Thus he begins the major section of the book with a consideration of Second Isaiah in which occurs a combination of elements found in three major portions of the Old Testament: prophets, historical writings, and psalms. He then moves on to discuss in separate chapters each of these major literary blocks plus the wisdom literature. In each chapter particular motifs are treated which are significant also in the New Testament portrayal of and response to the life of Jesus. Particular emphasis is given to elements of growth and blessing alongside momentary divine intervention.

The nature of the presentation makes a brief critical analysis of dubious value. I would raise questions concerning Westermann's treatment of later Old Testament concepts of law, the secular nature of wisdom, and creation as involving almost necessarily an implicit eschatology. The reader who wishes everything to reduce to a single thesis will perhaps find the book unsatisfying since its basic thrust is that such a superimposed unity falsifies the reality of the relationships. Other readers will find the variety of relationships more enriching than any

single pattern even when all of the connections which are made may not seem equally valid.

W. MALCOLM CLARK

Translating for King James: Notes made by a translator of King James's Bible, trans. and ed. by Ward Allen. Vanderbilt University Press, Nashville, 1969. Pp. xii + 157. \$10.00.

After the fifty or so translators of the King James, or so-called Authorized Version, of the Bible had finished their work, a small committee of scholars and churchmen assembled at Stationers Hall in London in 1610 to survey and revise the entire manuscript. Anthony Walker, in his sketch of the life of John Bois, a member of this final panel of review, reports, "Whilst they were employed in this last business, he, and he only, took notes of their proceedings; which notes he kept till his dying day" (1643).

Though the notes had been thought to be lost, in 1964 after a considerable amount of literary sleuthing, Professor Ward Allen of Auburn University in Alabama found in the library of Corpus Christi College at Oxford a copy of Bois's notes made by William Fulman, a seventeenth-century antiquarian. These handwritten notes, concerned with translational and exegetical problems in the Pauline and General Epistles and the book of Revelation, are reproduced in facsimile on the left-hand page, with a printed transcription on facing pages.

The Reverend John Bois was rector of Boxworth, prebendary of Ely, and a scholar and fellow of St. John's College in Cambridge and chief lecturer in Greek for ten years. According to Anthony Walker's archaic and charming biography, which appears as an appendix in this volume, John Bois was well-suited for the job of being secretary of the revision committee. At six years of age he could write Hebrew, and at fourteen entered the university. During his long and fruitful life (he lived to the then unusual age of eighty-three), he often spent sixteen hours a day in the library.

From this newly found sheaf of thirty-nine manuscript pages we now know that the

reviewing of the completed work of the translators took no more than nine months. Furthermore, these notes frequently reveal the kinds of problems to which the review committee gave attention, as well as, in some cases, the chief arguments for and against a certain rendering, along with occasional references to previous authors and their use of various Greek words and expressions.

Professor Allen deserves our thanks for making available a document that casts added light upon the process of producing what often has been called the noblest monument in English literature.

BRUCE M. METZGER

Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel, by Robert P. Meye. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Pp. 257. \$4.95.

The writer views "Jesus the Teacher," and "the Twelve" as important Markan motifs. He thinks that modern scholarship has emphasized the kerygmatic nature of Jesus' mission and message (p. 17) at the expense of investigating seriously "the shape and purpose of the company assembled about him" (p. 20). Meye's interest covers a wide range of material such as the didactic vocabulary of Mark, the didactic motif in Mark's narrative against the background of Rabbinic and Qumran patterns, the meaning and extent of discipleship in Mark, the historicity of the twelve (including the relationship between the twelve and the apostles), and Mark's own attitude toward the Twelve.

Meye's monograph attempts to probe the various texts of Mark that deal with the disciples. Their call, the author says, is due to the creative activity of Jesus (Mark 1:17 and 3:14-15) while their priorities are fellowship (p. 103) and service (p. 107). The author's exegesis of the texts which contain the term *apostoloi*—Mark 6:30 and 3:14 (bracketed in the Bible Society text)—leads him to the conclusion that the term in Mark can—with reason—be applied to the twelve (p. 190). A novel suggestion of Meye is that Mark's narratives of three crossings of the Galilean

sea contain a "didactic character" (p. 67). Does Mark limit discipleship to the Twelve? Meye thinks so but his exegesis of Mark 4:10 and 10:32 leaves this reader unconvinced. Is Mark's gospel a polemic against the twelve? Not at all, says the author, for the blindness and fear of the disciples "consistently underscores the glory of the Messianic revelation" (p. 224). The disciples, affirms Meye, "are not idealized figures, nor are they negative caricatures. But they are the men whom Jesus chose to be about him" (p. 223). Can the historicity of the twelve be maintained in the face of the varied picture of discipleship in the gospel tradition? It can, the writer claims, for though terminology differs in the description of those who were around Jesus, Mark—on his part—shows the conviction of the church that the twelve had a unique place in Jesus' life and work (p. 230).

At the outset, Meye intends to show the relationship between two views of Jesus held by Mark—Jesus the Son of God and Jesus the Teacher (pp. 30-32). It is doubtful whether his intention is realized. Surely the Markan church understood that Jesus is the Christ (Mark 1:1) no less than teacher (13:1) who by the Holy Spirit teaches the church how and what to speak even in times of persecution (13:11). But precisely how these kerygmatic and didactic elements fit together in Mark, Meye does not elucidate clearly. Meye *does* show a keen awareness of form critical (e.g., K. L. Schmidt and R. Bultmann) and history of redaction (e.g., W. Marxsen) approaches to Mark. To a degree, Meye's thesis parallels the work of Wrede. He finds, however, that while Wrede's view of the theological character of the second gospel (the "messianic secret" motif) has decisively influenced modern interpreters of Mark, Wrede failed to give full weight to the relationship of Jesus and the disciples.

In his conclusion, Meye weighs carefully the tradition of Papias on the composition of Mark. According to Papias, Mark was essentially concerned with Peter's *didaskalia*, "teaching," a fact which Meye is quick to appropriate in support of his own position. In brief, *Jesus and the Twelve* provides a needed check for those who see only a Markan kerygma in the second gospel.

CULLEN I K STORY

What is Form Criticism?, by Edgar V. McKnight. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, Penna., 1969. Pp. x + 86. \$2.25 (paper). *What is Redaction Criticism?*, by Norman Perrin. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, Penna., 1969. Pp. ix + 86. \$2.25 (paper). "Guides to Biblical Scholarship, New Testament Series," ed. by Dan O. Via, Jr.

Progress in Biblical scholarship is often revealed less by the attainment of "definitive" results than by the refinement of old methods and the gestation of new ones. Within living memory source criticism of the gospels begat form criticism and form criticism begat redaction criticism. The essentials of gospel source criticism are widely known, but the same is not true of those second- and third-generation disciplines. Form criticism, which studies the development of the tradition behind the gospels, has often been dismissed as the tool of wickedly sceptical Germans. Redaction criticism, which pursues the editorial policies and theological purposes of the individual evangelists, is so new that many recent books about the New Testament fail to mention it. Professors McKnight and Perrin (of Furman University and the University of Chicago respectively) have met, therefore, a real need by describing these two techniques of gospel research clearly, concisely, and accurately. The books follow a common outline: the origins of the technique, its employment by major scholars, and its bearing on our knowledge of the historical Jesus. Quite properly McKnight stresses the contributions of Dibelius and Bultmann, while Perrin emphasizes those of Lightfoot, Bornkamm, Conzelmann, and Marxsen. Perrin also gives the reader a direct taste of the type of criticism he is writing about by showing in detail how it may be applied to the Synoptic accounts of Jesus and the disciples at Caesarea Philippi. McKnight concentrates on expounding the work of others; Perrin is somewhat bolder in stating and arguing his own opinions. The bite and occasional dubiousness of the latter's conclusions are manifest in a remark that redaction criticism proves that the gospels do not portray the history of Jesus but rather "the history of

Christian experience in any and every age" (p. 75). Students, pastors, and inquiring laymen should find stimulating and informative reading in these slim volumes.

DAVID M. HAY

A Pastoral Counseling Casebook, by C. Knight Aldrich and Carl Nighswonger. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Penna., 1968. Pp. 224. \$5.95.

The actual content of this book is excellent and should be of help to every pastor. How to understand and deal with people in time of grief, of depression, in marital conflict, and so on, are all notably illuminated. Alcoholism is well discussed, as are adolescents, delinquency, and suicide. There is some case material from pastoral sources, and it is competently analyzed. The ultimate worth and relevance of the book lie in the competence and communicative ability of Dr. Aldrich, a psychiatrist. His performance is outstanding. He has both knowledge and wisdom, and a very considerable sense of relevance to the task of the clergyman. I do strongly commend the book.

But I have waited a long time to review it. It is miscalled, I think, a pastoral counseling casebook. For what it reports are issues, brought through cases presented by clergy, but always presented to Dr. Aldrich as psychiatrist, who then makes his analyses and suggestions. I do not believe that pastoral counseling is a matter on which psychiatrists are more expert than pastors. And I do not believe that the traffic between psychiatrists and clergy is all one way. I liked the content of this book from first glance. But I did not like the one-way street implication, that clergy regard psychiatrists as the great ones and lean on every word. So, for some time, I decided to ignore the book despite the excellence of its content.

Then I had a second thought, and wrote a "rip-roaring" letter to the authors, threatening them that I might write a review, but asking for their views on what seemed to me (and still does) the central issue, namely: Is the relationship of clergy and psychiatrists to be strictly one-way, with the psychiatrists

as knowledgeable experts informing the poor ignorant clergy? Both the authors were kind enough to reply and in perfect honesty. They indicated that the project on which this book is based was so designed that the participating clergy would bring in cases, and that Dr. Aldrich would be principal consultant in shedding light on them. He certainly has shed such light, in my judgment, and in a remarkably helpful and relevant way.

But this begs the question about whether the traffic is simply one-way. The Reverend Carl Nighswonger, chaplain at the University of Chicago Hospitals, and a remarkably able person, tries to deal with his passive role in the book in words like these, "I accept the responsibility for remaining peripheral which was essentially the role I assumed in the workshop. . . . This was a decision which I made consciously and deliberately, and for which I must accept the full responsibility including being accountable to those in the pastoral counseling field who might see this as a 'selling-out' to psychiatry." As Dr. Aldrich described it to me, Chaplain Nighswonger had agreed in advance to be simply "an intermediary and clarifier."

Especially with the talents shown by Dr. Aldrich, which are very unusual, one can rest content with this book as illuminating a lot of issues for clergy. But I still think that Chaplain Nighswonger "copped out" or else gave the book the wrong title. The book is really one on how the very intelligent psychiatric consultant can help clergy understand the problems confronting them in their cases. If it had been called, for instance, *A Psychiatrist Tries to Help Clergy with Their Case Problems*, or, *Psychiatric Help on Pastoral Problems*, then I could do nothing but applaud. But this is not *A Pastoral Counseling Casebook*.

I am still baffled at why Carl Nighswonger, one of our ablest pastors in this field, tries to bury himself and his insights under those of even a psychiatrist so able as Knight Aldrich. I do not think he is masochistic. Anyhow, the one thing we can enjoin on him is to get out a book of his own. This one is good, but mistitled.

SEWARD HILTNER

Preaching Today, by D. W. Cleverley Ford. Epworth Press & SPCK, London, England, 1969. Pp. 108. 15s.

Few books on preaching are being read today; fewer still are being published. However, a volume of some stature does appear occasionally and it is usually from the pen of someone who believes in preaching, who is competent in the art, and who is able to provide theological reasons for the conviction he holds. This new monograph in the growing list of books on preaching by the Director of the College of Preachers and Rural Dean of Westminster takes its rightful place beside H. Grady Davis' *Design for Preaching* and Paul Scherer's *The Word God Sent* as the only worthwhile treatises on homiletics in this decade.

There are six chapters that begin with the objections to preaching and continue with discussions of the origins, content, form, place, and future of preaching. A brief epilogue specifies the context in which Christian preaching is set—the context of the preacher's person, his congregation, and the art of worship.

The author does not live in a fool's paradise. He is cognizant of the character and temper of the present age and of the hazards encountering the communication of the Gospel through preaching. Nevertheless he understands the real nature of preaching, especially as he is led to see it as "a continuation of God's saving acts in history" (p. 20). Preaching reaches a low ebb when faith is weak and passive. "The apostles," he writes, "did not become preachers until something had happened to the Preacher, namely, the cross and resurrection of Jesus" (p. 25). And because of what they believed about these latter events the apostles had something to witness to and proclaim. Hence their message had a content which they preached in the faith that what they declared had occurred and could occur again.

The author, moreover, is a churchman. He would agree with P. T. Forsyth who said, "It is church and preacher together who reach the world." But the viability of preaching cannot be assumed or taken for granted; it must possess the necessary dynamic. Traditional preaching is not done for; however,

preaching that is not worth hearing is. But preachers who possess dynamism, who permit themselves to be trained in ways of personal involvement, and who portray invincible faith will be the most likely to effect "the commitment to Christ of the non-committed" (p. 89). It may be of more than passing significance that "the effects of *aggiornamento* in the Church of Rome are preaching and Bible reading" (p. 98). At the same time, the author would not endorse merely a preaching-piety-worship gestalt. Christian service is unavoidably necessary. "It is the context preaching always needs" (p. 108).

DONALD MACLEOD

Seeing Jesus Today, by John Bishop. Arthur James Ltd., Evesham, Worcs., England, 1969. Pp. 158. 17s.

As a writer of books and essays in the field of preaching and worship, John Bishop has made a large contribution to his denomination (Methodist) both in England and the United States. Among his varied publications this is his second book of sermons. The first, *Through the Christian Year* (1962), carried a Foreword by the famous British churchman, Maldwyn L. Edwards. This second one has an enthusiastic endorsement by the Scottish scholar, William Barclay, who comments: "It is the book of a preacher who has the gift of communication, and it has the great virtue that it makes theology come alive" (p. 9).

Here are fourteen sermons the author has unified around the theme of the person of Christ. "This is a book about Jesus the Man, the very center of our Christian faith," the author writes. Some of the chapters suggest an excellent series, for example, on the face, eyes, hands, feet, voice, and body of Jesus. Others are splendid responses to the traditional and challenging questions: What think ye of Christ? Why did Jesus die? And, what shall I do with Jesus? These pages identify John Bishop as a competent preacher in the textual tradition and as a writer of imaginative and classic prose. His congregation at Roselle, New Jersey, is fortunate to have a

preacher who respects his pulpit highly and takes his obligation to it seriously.

DONALD MACLEOD

The Crumbling Walls, by Lewis S. Mudge. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Penna., 1970. Pp. 171. \$2.65 (paper).

The purpose of this study is stated in the Preface: "[It is] an attempt to probe the meaning of certain experimental, radical forms of Christian community life" (p. 9). The need for such an inquiry was felt initially by the Faith and Order Department of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Hence this book is in the form of a report on the contemporary phenomenon of "crumbling walls" that hitherto had divided denominations over their acts of worship and the integrity of their respective orders. In view of the increase of "sacramental celebrations taking place across church lines," of "ostensibly illicit or irregular worship," and of liturgical activities "outside established church structures," some evaluation was considered to be both urgent and timely. Few persons were more competent to set the facts before us and to bring the study into focus than Lewis S. Mudge, Associate Professor of Religion and Philosophy, Amherst College, and one time director of the Theological Commission of the World Presbyterian Alliance with headquarters in Geneva.

This is a very useful report on an assignment that needed to be done. It faces up to the question whether after a half century of dialogue among the churches there has been "produced any clear examples, any imaginative picture, of what the community of Christian celebration in the world ought to be" (p. 16). Dr. Mudge opens up the discussion by way of a description of a particular case when "on June 2, 1968, in an apartment on the rue de Vaugirard in Paris, sixty-one Protestants and Roman Catholics, priests, ministers, and laymen, celebrated an extraordinary Communion service together" (p. 15). Taking off from this incident, the book is really a careful and thorough discussion of the question: where do we go from here? From the

ecumenical perspective, the author is honest in saying that "in practical terms, our understandings do not work" (p. 18). Who, then, is to find "the new way of doing Christian truth"? The experimenters? The radicals? Or is there some "more excellent way"?

Having raised the issue and identified worship as the "crisis area," Dr. Mudge continues with a lengthy chapter (63 pages) in which he reviews a dozen cases of experimental break-through both in new celebrations of worship and fresh re-orientations of the responsibility of ministry. From this survey he makes some tentative observations of real perception and consequence which, in turn, lead him into another major chapter (44 pages) of investigation into existing positions among the established churches.

The final chapter is entitled "Toward a Polity for Radical Ecumenism." Here Dr. Mudge understands "polity" as "the way the church operates and conceives of itself as a social reality in its total political—that is to say human—environment" (p. 137). Happily the author follows through and indicates the relevance the issues raised in the first three chapters have for the "grass roots" level of the Christian community. Moreover, he is sufficiently a realist to temper any prophetic evaluations of the new communities and, at the same time, is optimistic of Christianity's inherent capacity "to adapt itself, without loss of its central thrust, to conditions vastly different from those it has faced before" (p. 165).

This book deserves careful reading. It is intended as a report and, therefore, has sections that are somewhat pedestrian in style. It is, however, a competent handling of issues from a widely variegated field and, although we are undoubtedly between two eras, it provides creative suggestions and guidelines that may prove to be the best possible for the interim.

DONALD MACLEOD

Do You Understand What You Read?, by H. M. Kuitert (trans. by Lewis B. Smedes). Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1970. Pp. 111. \$1.95 (paper).

In *The Reformed Theological Review*, Professor H. M. Kuitert of the Free University in Amsterdam is described as "a promising young theologian 'on the way' who has the ability and the courage to strike out on his own in uncharted territory. He will bear watching by all those who take theology seriously."

The author of an earlier volume, *The Reality of Faith*, Dr. Kuitert has given us in this new monograph a helpful essay on understanding the nature and meaning of scripture. Written especially for laymen he invites them to re-examine many traditional assumptions and to embrace some obvious, though sometimes uncongenial, conclusions. Reactions to his theses have been varied: all the way from a negative "Read it—and condemn it" to Donald Bloesch's favorable estimate, "This is a lucid and penetrating statement on biblical authority for our time. . . . Kuitert seeks to hold in delicate balance the evangelical affirmation that the Bible is the Word of God and the findings of historical criticism which disclose the humanity of the Bible." Already more than 20,000 copies have been sold in the Netherlands.

In the course of eight cogent and provocative chapters, Dr. Kuitert asks many of the right questions and from the perspective of a shrewd theologian, gives commendable answers. The Bible, he claims, must be interpreted in order to be understood, but the latter is not possible unless the real purpose of scripture is discovered. The proclamation of Jesus Christ is at the basis of scripture (Acts 8:38) and its witness to him is its overall intention. He is both critical and fair in his estimate of Bultmann and Tillich; moreover, he is at ease in the reformed tradition when he denotes scripture as the interpreter and corrective of itself. Hence, for Kuitert, the Bible is not and cannot ever be a passive thing; it is used actively "by God the Spirit to make himself knowable" (p. 86).

This slim volume contains in summary the extended arguments and discussions of books of more impressive size. Ministers and leaders of lay study groups will welcome it as useful resource material.

DONALD MACLEOD

Revolution, Place and Symbol, ed. by Rolfe Lanier Hunt. International Conference on Religion, Architecture and the Visual Arts, 1969. (Room 510, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10027.) Pp. 318. \$5.95.

If you are firmly attached to the idea that church edifices should be monumental, standing at the center of the city and dominating its skyline, this journal will fail to warm your heart. It will, however, give you persuasive reasons for changing your mind. Architecture is not magic.

If you still believe that all of the faithful of the parish should gather together in one great service on Sunday mornings at eleven o'clock to celebrate the mysteries and hear the word preached, you will find yourself out of date and out of step with almost all of the contributors to this volume. On the other hand, you will learn that small group worship on an intimate level is in vogue and why it is popular. Eleven o'clock is not *the* sacred hour today.

If you are aware that Christianity is in the midst of a revolution which shakes not only theology but aesthetics, and if you wonder where the answers are and what they may turn out to be, this book will stimulate and inform you beyond most on this topic. Provocative ideas abound.

Revolution, Place and Symbol is the diary of the First International Congress on Religion, Architecture and the Visual Arts which took place between August 26 and September 4, 1967 in New York and in Montreal. It is a compilation of the major addresses given, responses to them, and excerpts from seminar dialogues and reports and evaluations published subsequently.

The purpose of the conference, according to the general chairman, John E. Morse, is the best guide to book. Mr. Morse states the meeting was held "to examine the forces changing contemporary life and religious institutions; describe the relationships among religion, architecture and art in expressing the religious needs of contemporary man; probe the historical relationship between man and his expression through art and architecture; study the performance of art and archi-

ture in the service of religious groups; consider the future needs of the community of believers; and suggest architectural and artistic responses to those needs" (p. v). No slight undertaking to be sure! But, one which met with considerable success due to careful planning and astute selection of participants.

Following the life-situation method of Harry Emerson Fosdick, one can summarize briefly the journal in this way:

The felt problem: How shall modern man build and decorate to express the presence of God in a secular, pluralistic society where the church rapidly is becoming disestablished?

The definition of the problem: Here one must take into account the economic, political, philosophical, theological, architectural, aesthetic and cosmological factors which have brought about the problem and influenced its possible solutions.

Possible solutions: These rest on whether or not there is such a thing as "religious" art and architecture. There are those who say "yes"—namely Lady Susan Glyn and the noted architect Philip Johnson. The majority (at this congress at least) say "No."

The main thesis propounded is that the presence of God in this world is only symbolized by the faithful community of believers and their common life. It is not to be found in "sacred spaces" or impressive vast structures. So, art and architecture serve the religious community when they enclose space in such a way as to allow this personalized symbolization to take place realistically. They should never compete with it, detract from it or be a substitute for it. Once again the sound principle is heard: the lit-

urgy states the requirements for the place in which it takes place, not the contrary.

The journal includes examples of appropriate buildings drawn from both Christian and Jewish edifices, domestic and foreign. Unfortunately, there are no pictorial illustrations, only verbal ones.

One facet of the Congress was devoted to special trends of church life and worship such as movies, disposable art and celebrations or happenings. Perhaps these were the more controversial topics included. To read of them two years later reminded the reviewer of how fast the scene is moving—what was *avant garde* yesterday is stale today.

The directory of contributors to this volume is impressive to say the least: Abraham Ribicoff, François Houtart, Joseph Sittler, Harvey Cox, Dan Callahan, Thomas F. Mathews, Philip Johnson, Frederic Dubuyst, J. G. Davies, Mary Corita Kent, August Hecksher, and R. Buckminster Fuller—to name a few leading lights. Their clear thinking and level of concerned involvement keep this book from being a "parade of stars."

The reviewer found this book fascinating because it reveals what aesthetic religious people are thinking and doing. But it would be equally valid for a parish minister whose congregation was about to relocate or rebuild. Specific answers are not given, but the questions raised must be dealt with by anyone about to spend money bulding for God amidst revolutionary times.

CARL D. REIMERS

Princeton Day School
Princeton, New Jersey

ADDRESSES OF PUBLISHERS

Abingdon Press, 201 Eighth Avenue South, Nashville, Tenn. 37203
Augsburg Publishing House, 426 South Fifth Street, Minneapolis, Minn. 55415
Cambridge University Press, 32 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022
Dickenson Publishing Company, Inc., Belmont, Calif. 94002
Wm. B. Eerdmans, 255 Jefferson S.E., Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502
Epworth Press, 27 Marylebone Road, London N.W. 1
Fortress Press, 2900 Queen Lane, Philadelphia, Penna. 19129
Harper & Row, Publishers, 49 East 33rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10016
Arthur James Ltd., Evesham, Worcester, England
Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, Calif. 94305
Vanderbilt University Press, Nashville, Tenn. 37203
The Westminster Press, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Penna. 19107

FACULTY PUBLICATIONS, 1969

EDITED BY LAURENCE H. STOOKEY

JOHN WM. ALDRIDGE

Article

"Memphis: The Pain of Transition," in *Tempo*, II, 7, 5-11.

Reviews

J. McDowell Richards, ed., *Soli Deo Gloria*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 89.
Albert B. Cleage, *The Black Messiah*, *ibid.*, 95.
Leon Howell, *Freedom City*, in *The Presbyterian Outlook*, CLI, 44, 15.

DIOGENES ALLEN

Articles

"Tactile and Non-tactile Awareness," in *Mind*, LXXVIII, 312, 567-570.
"Theological Reflection on the Natural World," in *Theology Today*, XXV, 4, 435-445.

Reviews

Peter R. Baelz, *Christian Theology and Metaphysics*, in *Presbyterian Outlook*, CL, 39, 15.
D. Z. Phillips, *Religion and Understanding*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 83-84.
P. LeFebvre, ed., *Philosophical Resources for Christian Thought*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 2, 100.
George Crespy, *From Science to Theology*, *ibid.*, 100.
Harry Givertz, ed., *Contemporary Moral Issues*, *ibid.*, 101.

General

Acting Editor, *Theology Today*.

BERNHARD W. ANDERSON

Articles

"The Contemporaneity of the Bible," in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 2, 38-50.
"An Exposition of Genesis 32," in *Australian Biblical Review*, XVII, 21-26.

Reviews

Niek Poulssen, *König und Tempel im Glaubenszeugnis des Alten Testaments*, in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXXI, 3, 450-452.
James Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments*, in *Drew Gateway*, XXXIX, 3, 180-183.
Martin Buber, *Kingdom of God*, *ibid.*, 183-185.

W. MALCOLM CLARK

Article

"A Legal Background to the Yahwist's Use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2-3," in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVIII, 4, 266-278.

Reviews

Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms II: 51-100* (=The Anchor Bible, No. 17), in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 2, 78-79.
Rolf Rendtorff, *Men of the Old Testament*, *ibid.*, 86-87.
André Parrot, *Abraham and His Times*, *ibid.*, 87-88.
Pierre Montet, *Egypt and the Bible*, *ibid.*, 88.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

Reviews

Bo Johnson, *Die Armenische Bibelübersetzung als hexaplarischer Zeuge im 1. Samuelbuch*, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LXXXIX, 4, 781-782.
Edward Ullendorf, *Ethiopia and the Bible* [The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1967], in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVII, 2, 234-235.
A. Roy Eckardt, *Elder and Younger Brothers: The Encounter of Jews and Christians*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 86.
I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, *ibid.*, 86-87.

Christian D. Ginsburg, *Jacob ben Chajim ibn Adonijah's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, Hebrew and English, and The Massoreth Ha-Massoreth of Elias Levita*, ed., with trans. and notes (1897); reprint with Prolegomenon by Norman H. Snaith (1968), *ibid.*, 2, 85.

DAVID HAY

Article

"Paul's Indifference to Authority," in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVIII, 1, 36-44.

Review

Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVIII, 1, 95-96.

SEWARD HILTNER

Books

Ferment in the Ministry, Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., pp. 222.

Pastoral Counseling, paperback edition, Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., pp. 291 (original date, 1949).

Pastoral Counseling, Japanese edition, trans. by Tsugikazu Nishagaki, Board of Publications, The United Church of Christ in Japan, Tokyo, pp. 450.

Chapter in Book

Foreword to *Learning for Loving*, by Robert McFarland and John D. Burton, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., pp. 5-7.

Articles

"An Appraisal of the Lambourne Appraisal," in *Journal of Religion and Health*, VIII, 4, 327-334.

"Comments on the Integration of Psychology and Theology in a Ph.D. Program by Clement," in *Newsletter of the Corresponding Committee of Fifty, Division 12*, The American Psychological Association, 1969, 19-21.

"The Contribution of the Behavioral Sciences to Pastoral Care and Counseling," in *Ministry Studies*, III, 2, 10-17.

"Simon Doniger," in *Pastoral Psychology*, XX, 190, 5-7.

"Rethinking Prayer," *ibid.*, 193, 5-7.

"On Getting Another Job," *ibid.*, 195, 5-7.

"Fathers and Sons," in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 53-57.

"Psychology and the Church" (The John Sutherland Bonnell Lecture for 1968), pub. in pamphlet form by the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York; reprinted in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 2, 24-37.

"Psychoanalysis and Psychoanalytic Education: What Kind of Journey?" in *The Psychoanalytic Forum*, III, 1969, 259-261.

"God's Promises and Man's," in *Theology Today*, XXVI, 2, 103-106.

E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN

Books

Rethinking the Great Commission in an Age of Revolution (The Belk Lectures for 1968, Second Series), St. Giles Presbyterian Church, Richmond, Virginia.

Pendidikan Agama Kristen (with I. H. Enklaar), Baden Penerbit Kristen, Djakarta; third edition, 1969.

Chapter in Book

"Vision and Vocation," in *The Upper Room Disciplines*, 1970, Sulon G. Ferree, ed., Upper Room, Nashville, Tenn., pp. 350-356.

Articles

"Theological Education in the Service of the Church and World," in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 3, 21-36.

"The Church in the World," in *Theology Today*, XXV, 4, 462-473; XXVI, 2, 172-184; XXVI, 3, 312-322.

Reviews

Karl Barth, *Action in Waiting*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 3, 89-90.

Henry Horn, *The Christian in Modern Style*, *ibid.*, 90-91.

Allan Brockway, *The Secular Saint*, *ibid.*, 91-92.

George William Bowman III, *Dynamics of Confession*, *ibid.*, 110-111.

Douglas Rhymes, *Prayer in the Secular City*, *ibid.*, 111-112.

Rodney Stark and Charles Y. Glock, *American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment*, in *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XXXIII, 2, 296-297.

Robert Hassenger, ed., *The Shape of Catholic Higher Education*, *ibid.*, 297-298.

Ian Henderson, *A Study in Ecumenical Politics*, in *The Christian Century*, LXXXVI, 36, 1139.

General

Contributing Editor, *Theology Today*.

NORMAN V. HOPE

Articles

"Stalwarts of the Reformation," in *Presbyterian Life*, XXII, 3, 39-40.

"Being Christian in an Affluent Society," in *Christianity Today*, XIII, 10, 7-8.

"Does God Lead Us into Temptation?" *ibid.*, 20, 13-14.

"Paul's Thorn and Ours," *ibid.*, XIV, 5, 222-223.

"How to be Good and Mad," in *Lutheran Standard*, IX, 17, 2-5.

"Letter from America," in *British Weekly*, XCV, 4323, 7.

Reviews

A. Ian Dunlop, *William Carstares and the Kirk by Law Established*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 90-91.

Ronald C. D. Jasper, *George Bell, Bishop of Chichester*, *ibid.*, 91-92.

C. Gordon Bolam, Jeremy Goring, et al., *The English Presbyterians*, *ibid.*, 2, 93-94.

Bertrand Russell, *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, *ibid.*, 94-95.

Charles Davis, *A Question of Conscience*, *ibid.*, 95-96.

Donald F. Durnbaugh, *The Believers' Church: The History and Character of Radical Protestantism*, *ibid.*, 3, 98-99.

Robert M. Kingdon, *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement, 1564-1572*, *ibid.*, 99-100.

Geoffrey Barraclough, *The Medieval Papacy*, *ibid.*, 100.

Roland H. Bainton, *Erasmus of Christendom*, *ibid.*, 101-102.

EDWARD J. JURJI

Book

Religious Pluralism and World Community, ed., E. J. Brill, Leiden, pp. 314; "Introduction: Religious Pluralism and World Community," 1-20; "Epilogue," 297-308.

Articles

"Religious Convergence and the Course of Prejudice," in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XXXVII, 2, 297-308.

"The Islamic Setting in the History of Religions," in *Islamic Studies (Journal of the Islamic Research Institute of Pakistan)*, VIII, 4, 301-317.

Reviews

A. J. Arberry, ed., *Religion in the Middle East* (2 vols.), in *The Christian Century*, LXXXVI, 49, 1552-1554; also in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 3, 102-103.

Farid Ad-Din Attar, *Muslim Saints and Mystics: Episode from the Tadhkirat al-Aluyya*, A. J. Arberry, tr., in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LXCIX, 4, 802-804; also in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 2, 91-93.

General

Advisory Editor, *The Muslim World*.

Book Review Editor, *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*.

S T KIMBROUGH, JR.

Article

"The Ethic of the Qumran Community," in *Revue de Qumran*, VI, 483-498.

LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER

Book

The Problem of Christian Unity in Early Nineteenth-Century America (in *Facet Books: Historical Series*, 12), Fortress Press, Philadelphia, pp. 25.

Article

"Presbyterians," in *Collier's Encyclopedia*.

Review

Jerald C. Brauer, ed., *Reinterpretation in American Church History*, in *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, XXIV, 3, 291-294.

DONALD MACLEOD

Sermons

"A Balanced Life in an Unbalanced World," in *Pulpit Preaching*, XXII, 2, 1 & 30-32.

"Believing is Seeing," in Doran's *Ministers Manual*, ed. by Charles L. Wallis, pp. 198-199.

"Bringing God into Thanksgiving," *ibid.*, p. 298.

"Thanksgiving Prayer," *ibid.*, pp. 298-299.

Editorials

"Excerpta et Commentaria," in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 3-II; 2, 3-II; 3, 3-II.

Reviews

E. Stanley Jones, *A Song of Ascents: A Spiritual Autobiography*, in *The Christian Century*, LXXXVI, 14, 451.

Robert G. Tuttle, *Thoughts for Doubting Christians*, in *The Presbyterian Outlook*, CLI, 37, 15.

David A. Wolber, *Getting Ready for Christmas*, *ibid.*, 38, 15.

David A. MacLennan, *Sermons from Thanksgiving to Easter*, *ibid.*, 40, 15; also in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 2, 105-106.

James S. Stewart, *The Wind of the Spirit*, *ibid.*, 42, 15.

Richard Luecke, *Violent Sleep*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 97.

John H. Withers, *In the Red*, *ibid.*, 97-98.

Gordon E. Harris, *The Way of Acceptance*, *ibid.*

John Banks, *Is There a Word from the Lord?*, *ibid.*

Ralph G. Turnbull, *The Preacher's Heritage, Task, and Resources*, *ibid.*, 98-99.

Roy Lawrence, *They Asked for a Story*, *ibid.*, 2, 106-107.

John D. Searle, *Look and Listen*, *ibid.*

Margaret Love, *Let's Dramatize*, *ibid.*

Gordon E. Harris, *A Ministry Renewed*, *ibid.*, 3, 105.

Edward Viening, *The Zondervan Topical Bible*, *ibid.*, 105-106.

George F. Garland, *Subject Guide to Bible Stories*, *ibid.*, 106.

Edward L. R. Elson, *One Moment with God*, *ibid.*

John R. Fry, *Fire and Blackstone*, *ibid.*, 107.

General

Editor, *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*.

JAMES I. McCORD

Articles

"Our Theological Responsibility," in *Encounter*, XXX, 1, 17-24.

"Perspectives on Man," in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 12-18.

"Ministry in a Revolutionary Time," *ibid.*, LXII, 3, 12-20; also in *Your Church*, XV, 6, 19-23, 54-59.

"Professor Barnabas Nagy—A Personal Memoir," in *Reformatusok Lapja*, LXIX, 12, 12-13.

"Perspectives on Faith and Order," in *Mid-Stream*, VIII, 3, 1-7.

BRUCE M. METZGER

Book

The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content, British edition, Lutterworth Press, London, pp. 288 (paperback).

Chapters in Books

"A Comparison of the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary and the Greek Gospel Lectionary," in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*, ed. by E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, pp. 209-220.

"The Meaning of Christ's Ascension," in *Search the Scriptures: New Testament Studies in Honor of Raymond T. Stamm*, ed. by J. M. Myers, O. Reimherr, and H. N. Bream, E. J. Brill, Leiden, pp. 118-128.

Reviews

J. N. Sanders, *The Gospel According to St. John*, in *Christianity Today*, XIII, 16, 20 [720].

E. J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of*

Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, in *Gnomon*, XL, 831-833.

Edward Malatesta, *St. John's Gospel 1920-1965*, in *Biblica*, XLIX, 584f.

J. Coert Rylaarsdam, ed., *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship*, in *Theology Today*, XXVI, 1, 96-99.

Wolfhart Pannenburg, *Jesus—God and Man*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 71-74.

Gerhard Friedrich, ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, *ibid.*, 3, 97.

Otto Betz, *What Do We Know About Jesus?*, *ibid.*, 97.

General

Editor, *The New Testament of the Oxford Annotated Bible*, Illustrated School Edition, Oxford University Press and Geoffrey Chapman, London, pp. 342 (paperback).

Editor, Vol. IX of *New Testament Tools and Studies*, being *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, by Ernest C. Colwell, E. J. Brill, Leiden, and Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. viii + 175.

Editorial supervisor of Bible Dictionary for the Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible, included in the *Church School Student's Bible*, The World Publishing Co., Cleveland and New York, 60 dbl. col. pgs.

DANIEL L. MIGLIORE

Article

"Biblical Eschatology and Political Hermeneutics," in *Theology Today*, XXVI, 2, 116-132.

Sermon

"Vietnam Moratorium," in *P. T. S. Alumni News*, XI, 2, 4-5.

Reviews

Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Theology and the Kingdom of God*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 2, 101-102.

Norman Pittenger, *Process Thought and Christian Faith*, *ibid.*, 102-103.

General

Acting Book Review Editor, *Theology Today*.

RICHARD SHAULL

Books

Containment and Change, Dutch edition, Amboboeken, Utrecht; Portuguese edition, Paz e Terra, Rio de Janeiro; German edition, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt.
Uitdaging aan Kerk en Maatschappij, Het Wereldvenster, Baarn, pp. 235.

Chapters in Books

"Resistance and the Third World," in *Delivered into Resistance*, Milwaukee Fourteen Defense Committee, Milwaukee, pp. 60-64.
"Der Christliche Glaube als Skandal in einer Technokratischen Welt," in *Diskussion Zur "Theologie der Revolution"*, E. Feil and R. Weth, eds., Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München, pp. 29-40.

Articles

"Does Religion Demand Social Change?" in *Theology Today*, XXVI, 1, 5-13.
"National Development and Social Revolution," Part I, in *Christianity and Crisis*, XXVIII, 24, 347-348; Part II, *ibid.*, XXIX, 1, 9-12.
"The Challenge to the Seminary," *ibid.*, 6, 81-86.
"Repression Brazilian Style," *ibid.*, 198-199.
"A New Look at the Sectarian Option," in *Student World*, LXI, 4, 294-299.
"Crisis in the Young Church," in *National Christian Council Review*, LXXXIX, 1, 22-26.
"Une Communauté Chrétienne Subversive," in *Tribune de Genève* (Supplément), 290, 1 (Dec. 11, 1969).

Reviews

Daniel B. Stevick, *Civil Disobedience and the Christian*, in *Religious Education*, LXIV, 5, 404-406.
Dom Helder Camara, *The Church and Colonialism*, in *The Christian Century*, LXXXVI, 45, 1421-1422.

LAURENCE H. STOOKEY

Chapter in Book

"Communion Prayers from The Didache," in *Ventures in Worship*, ed. by David James

Randolph, Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., pp. 80-82.

Articles

"Baptism and Liturgical Integrity Reconsidered," in *The Christian Century*, LXXXVI, 35, 1109-1113.

"The Gothic Cathedral as the Heavenly Jerusalem: Liturgical and Theological Sources," in *Gesta (Journal of the International Center of Medieval Art)*, VIII, 35-41.

Reviews

John Killinger, *The Word Not Bound*, in *The Presbyterian Outlook*, CLI, 27, 15.

Max Miller and Louise C. Drew, *Sing of Life and Faith*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 1, 100-101.

Erik Routley, *Words, Music, and the Church*, *ibid.*, 101-103.

Keith Watkins, *Liturgies in a Time When Cities Burn*, *ibid.*, 2, 108-109.

DeWitte Holland, ed., *Preaching in American History*, *ibid.*, 3, 103-105.

General

Assistant to the Editor, *Theology Today*.

GEORGE H. TAVARD

Book

La Tradition au XVIIe Siècle en France et en Angleterre, Editions du Cerf, Paris, pp. 514.

Articles

"The Present Ecumenical Moment: A Personal View," in *One in Christ*, V, 3, 248-262.

"The Depths of Tradition," in *Continuum*, VII, 3, 427-437.

"Roman Catholic Theology and 'Recogni-

tion of Ministry,'" in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, VI, 4, 623-628.

CHARLES C. WEST

Book

Ethics, Violence and Revolution, Council on Religion and International Affairs, New York.

Chapters in Books

"Act and Being in Christian and Marxist Perspective," in *Openings for Marxist-Christian Dialogue*, ed. by Thomas Ogle-tree, Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., pp. 72-97.

"Reconciliation and World Peace," in *Reconciliation in Today's World*, ed. by Allen O. Miller, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., pp. 105-122.

"Varieties of Unbelief," in *Lambert Essays on Faith*, ed. by the Archbishop of Canterbury, S.P.C.K., London, pp. 40-74.

Articles

"Theologian of the Resurrection," in *Christian Peace Conference*, XXIX, 18-19.

"Christianity and China," in *World Outlook*, XXX, 2, 8-11.

Reviews

Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Who is a Christian?* in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, VI, 4, 648-649.

Hendrik Nys, *Le Salut sans l'Evangile*, *ibid.*, 1, 114-115.

Michael Novak, *A Theology for Radical Politics*, in *The Christian Century*, LXXXVI, 31, 1021.

James M. Gustafson, *Christ and the Moral Life*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXII, 2, 97-98.

Ralph B. Potter, *War and Moral Discourse*, *ibid.*, 98-99.

Jas. I. McCord, *Chairman, Editorial Committee*

John A. Mackay, *Honorary Chairman*

Hugh T. Kerr, *Editor*

CONTENTS FOR JULY, 1970

Editorial:

For Every Solution There Is a Problem	<i>Diogenes Allen</i>
Josef Lukl Hromadka (1889-1969)	<i>E. G. Homrighausen</i>
The Legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr.	<i>Coretta Scott King</i>
Communication and Community	<i>Paul S. Minear</i>
The Primacy of Philosophical Theology	<i>Kai Nielsen</i>
A New Church for a New World	<i>John William Aldridge</i>
Technological Utopia and the Theology of Hope	<i>Kenneth Vaux</i>
The Church in the World	<i>E. G. Homrighausen</i>

Critic's Corner:

On the Dark Side of the Love of Art	<i>Philipp P. Fehl</i>
Process Theology Revisited	<i>Norman Pittenger</i>

Review Section

THEOLOGY TODAY

Box 29, PRINCETON, N.J. 08540

Please enter my subscription to THEOLOGY TODAY for year(s) for which I enclose \$ (*Sample copy on request*)

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____ Zip _____

Subscription rates:

U.S., Canada, and Mexico:	\$3 for 1 year; \$5 for 2 years
Great Britain:	25/ per year to Blackwell's, Oxford, England
All other countries:	\$3.50 for 1 year; \$6 for 2 years
Student rate:	\$2 per year

CHECK PAYABLE TO "THEOLOGY TODAY" IN U.S. FUNDS

Have you missed *Theology Today*?

By William Hamilton

The New Optimism:
From Prufrock to Ringo
January, 1966

By Carl E. Braaten

Toward a Theology of Hope
July, 1967

By Emil Brunner

Easter Certainty
April, 1961

By Carlos Baker

The Place of the Bible
in American Fiction
April, 1960

By James I. McCord

The Seminary and
Theological Mission
October, 1960

By George F. Kennan

World Problems in
Christian Perspective
July, 1959

By Robert Lee

Religion and Leisure
in American Culture
April, 1962

Special Symposium on Tillich

Contributors:

Robert C. Johnson
Edward A. Dowey
Gordon D. Kaufmann
George S. Hendry
April, 1958

By Peter Berger

The Religious Establishment
and Theological Education
July, 1962

By Bruce M. Metzger

The New Testament
View of the Church
October, 1962

By John Hick

Is Religion an
American Heresy?
April, 1961

By Daniel Callahan

Self-Identity in an
Urban Society
April, 1967

Single Back Issues of THEOLOGY TODAY: \$1.00

Subscriptions:

U.S.A., Canada and
Mexico:
\$3.00 per year
\$5.00 for two years

Great Britain:
25/ per year to Agent:
B. H. Blackwell, Ltd.
48-51 Broad Street
Oxford, England

All Other Countries:
\$3.50 for one year
\$6.00 for two years

THEOLOGY TODAY, Box 29, PRINCETON, N.J. 08540

**Major reference work—
now revised and enlarged**
edited by
Henry Snyder Gehman
Professor Emeritus, Princeton Seminary



THE NEW WESTMINSTER DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE

Illustrations edited by Robert B. Wright

This authoritative, comprehensive, illustrated dictionary — a standard reference work for more than 25 years — has now been brought completely up to date, with *hundreds of new entries*, taking into account the latest findings of archaeology and Biblical scholarship. It is an immensely valuable ecumenical tool; superbly designed to serve the needs of students and scholars, ministers, teachers, and laymen. 1,064 pages.

- *Over 5000 entries* — covering every significant word, phrase, and name in the entire Bible
- *More than 450 illustrations*
- *Many aids to understanding and study*, including 16 full-color maps



\$10.95, now at your bookstore

**THE
WESTMINSTER
PRESS**

Witherspoon Bldg.,
Philadelphia, Pa. 19107